

Vol. XXXIII.

APRIL, 1956.

No. 2

THE AUSTRALASIAN
Catholic Record

FOR CLERGY
AND RELIGIOUS



*The Official Organ for communications issued by the
Apostolic Delegate to Australasia.*

Announcements

MSS, queries and books for review, should be addressed to the Editor, St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

Queries relating to S. Scripture, Moral Theology, Canon Law, Liturgy, or any subject of professional interest, are cordially invited. Name and address, even if not intended for publication, must accompany all Queries.

Notice of change of address, and correspondence about missing and back numbers, should be addressed to the Manager, St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

SUBSCRIPTIONS: *Yearly, in advance, 15/-.*

Remittances should be sent to the Manager or the Diocesan Collector, either by postal order or cheque.

The clergy of each diocese are invited to appoint one of their number to collect and forward their annual subscriptions.

The following priests are acting as collectors and representatives for the *Australasian Catholic Record* in their respective dioceses:—

Archdiocese of Sydney—A.C.R. Staff.

Archdiocese of Perth—Rt. Rev. J. T. McMahon, M.A., Ph.D., South Perth, W.A.

Archdiocese of Wellington—Rev. T. Duffy, Military Camp, Waiouru, N.Z.

Archdiocese of Adelaide—Rev. D. O'Connell, Murray Bridge, S.A.

Archdiocese of Brisbane—Rev. V. Carroll, P.P., Kingaroy, Q.

Archdiocese of Hobart—Rev. J. Wallis, Hobart, Tas.

Archdiocese of Canberra and Goulburn — Rev. J. Blakeney, P.P., Tumut, N.S.W.

Diocese of Armidale—Very Rev. J. O'Connor, Armidale, N.S.W.

Diocese of Auckland—Rt. Rev. L. Buxton, D.C.L., M.A., Hamilton, N.Z.

Diocese of Ballarat—Rt. Rev. J. H. Gleeson, St. Arnaud, Vic.

Diocese of Bathurst—V. Rev. M. J. Dunne, B.A., Dubbo, N.S.W.

Diocese of Bunbury—V. Rev. C. Cunningham, Dardanup, W.A.

Diocese of Christchurch—V. Rev. T. Liddy, Adm., Christchurch, N.Z.

Diocese of Darwin—Rev. W. Henschke, M.S.C., Darwin, N.T.

Diocese of Dunedin—Rev. A. Loughnan, St. Mary's, Dunedin, N.Z.

Diocese of Geraldton—Rev. N. Tobin, Cathedral, Geraldton, W.A.

Diocese of Lismore—V. Rev. T. Morris, P.P., Smithtown, N.S.W.

Diocese of Maitland—Rev. T. Cronin, Sandgate, N.S.W.

Diocese of Port Augusta—Very Rev. W. P. Kain, Pekina, S.A.

Diocese of Rockhampton—V. Rev. D. G. Tiernan, Rockhampton, Q.

Diocese of Sale—Rt. Rev. J. Fitzpatrick, Leongatha, V.

Diocese of Sandhurst—Rev. J. Hussey, Adm., Wangaratta, V.

Diocese of Toowoomba—Rev. M. Mahon, Adm., Warwick, Q.

Diocese of Townsville—Rt. Rev. K. J. H. Kelly, D.D., Ayr, Q.

Diocese of Wagga—Rt. Rev. J. Larkins, P.P., Albury, N.S.W.

Diocese of Wilcannia-Forbes — Very Rev. Dean J. Sexton, V.F., Nyngan, N.S.W.

Diocese of Wollongong—Rev. W. J. Neilson, Thirroul, N.S.W.

Abbacy of New Norcia—Rev. R. Hynes, P.P., Wyalkatchem, W.A.

Editor:

V. Rev. Mgr. T. VEECH.

Manager: REV. F. A. MECHAM,
St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

The Australasian Catholic Record

A Quarterly Publication under Ecclesiastical Sanction

"Pro Ecclesia Dei." St. Augustine.

Contents:

OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS,	
Rev. William Leonard, D.D., D.S.S.	95
Encyclical on Sacred Music—Books condemned by Holy Office.	
THE SCRIPTURAL CONTROVERSY BETWEEN ST. JEROME AND ST. AUGUSTINE,	
Rev. Henry Davis, Ph.D., L.S.S.	103
ARCHDEACON JOHN McENCROE (1795-1868), X,	
Rev. Roger Wynne	117
DOGMATIC THEOLOGY Rev. Clement Tierney, D.D.	129
The Sacrament of Baptism in the liturgy of the Easter Vigil.	
MORAL THEOLOGY, Right Rev. Mgr. James Madden, D.D.	138
Mutilation of the human body: Transplantation of members—Faculties for confessions of religious sisters.	
CANON LAW Very Rev. Mgr. George Gallen, D.C.L.	149
Canon 988 and Irregularities from crime.	
LITURGY Rev. Patrick Murphy, D.D.	159
Prayers after Mass—Votive mass on first Friday—Sermons before Blessed Sacrament—Reverences to altar—The apostolate and the sacraments—Australian Liturgical Week.	
HOMILETICS Rev. William Leonard, D.D., D.S.S.	167
Humility and membership of the Church.	
NOTES	174
A mid-century survey of the Bible (Rev. H. G. Davis, Ph.D., L.S.S.) —Before the catastrophe (Very Rev. Mgr. T. Veech).	
BOOK REVIEWS	183
The Unity of Philosophical Experience (Gilson); The Local Superior in non-exempt clerical congregations (McGrath); Legislation and requirements for permissible cohabitation in invalid marriages (Sulli- van); Two Portraits of St. Theresa of Lisieux (Robo); Only Son (Farrell); The Devil's Hunting Ground (Blamires); Life of Christ (Ricciotti); The Mystical Theology of St. Bernard (Gilson); Church and State through the centuries (Edit. Ehler); Sermon Outlines (Connell).	
SHORT NOTICES	148, 182

Nihil Obstat :

RICHARDUS COLLENDER

CENSOR DEPUTATUS.

Imprimatur :

✠ N.T. CARD. GILROY,

ARCHIEP. SYDNEYENSIS.

1a die Aprilis, 1956.

Official Documents

SUMMARY OF THE ENCYCLICAL ON SACRED MUSIC

The purpose of the Encyclical is stated at the very outset. The Pope says: "We always took a very great interest in sacred music. Hence our resolution to take up the subject once more and treat it in these Encyclical Letters. As we set the matter forth in order, there will be occasion to elucidate many questions which have cropped up and have been discussed in these last decades. We are concerned that this noble and liberal art should continue more and more to add splendour to the celebration of divine worship and to foster the spiritual life of the Christian people. This Encyclical is, moreover, a response to the desires expressed by many of yourselves, Venerable Brethren; it is also a response to programmes which celebrated musicians and promoters of this great art have put forward in musical congresses; lastly, it takes into account whatever pastoral experience or the happy progress of musical studies have found worthy of consideration. Thus we hope that the prescriptions which St. Pius X wisely laid down as "a juridical code of sacred music" will be confirmed and inculcated, will be set in new light and upheld by new reasons, in such wise that the noble art of sacred music will be better adapted to present day conditions, and be so enriched as to respond more fully to its high purpose."

I

God, in Whom the harmony of perfect concord and of all beautiful consonance supremely exists, created men "to his image and likeness." The faculty of music is amongst the great gifts of nature with which God adorned man. Like the other liberal arts, music belongs to the sphere of spiritual joys. It delights the mind. The science and sense of good modulation St. Augustine regarded as given by God to impress a lesson of great importance.

Hence the universal use of music at all times, in order to give to religious ceremonies beauty and decorum. Not only amongst heathen peoples does antiquity show this employment of music but we also find it in the worship of the true God amongst the Chosen People. Mary, the sister of Moses, under prophetic inspiration led the song of the triumphant people with the accompaniment of her timbrel. At the translation of the ark from the house of Obededom to the city of David, the king himself "and all Israel played before the Lord on all manner of

instruments made of wood, on harps and lutes and timbrels and cornets and cymbals." (2 Sam. 6:5.)

David set an order for music and song in sacred worship. That order was restored after the exile and remained till the time of the Divine Redeemer. The Church from the beginning used this art, as we know from St. Paul, who says to the Ephesians: "Be filled with the Holy Spirit, speaking to yourselves in psalms and hymns, and spiritual canticles." (5:18.) When the Christians met for worship the psalm was in evidence (I Cor. 14:26). After the apostolic age Pliny attests that Christians gathered in the morning and sang a hymn to Christ as to God (Ep. X, 96,9); and of his time Tertullian tells us that in the meetings of the Christians "the Scriptures were read, psalms sung, and sermons spoken" (De anima c. 9; Apol 39).

When the Church obtained her liberty, psalms and hymns were in daily use; and little by little new forms of sacred chant were invented and cultivated by the Scholae Cantorum, especially in the city of Rome. St. Gregory, as tradition asserts, collected the treasures of chant that had been handed down and, as it were, codified what came to be known as Gregorian chant. This chant spread from Rome to most of the Christian countries of Europe and from the 8th or 9th century was accompanied by organ music.

From the ninth century also polyphonic chant made its appearance and followed its way of development up to the admirable perfection of the supreme artists of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. This polyphonic chant the Church always highly honoured and used for the enhancement of worship in the Roman basilicas and in the papal ceremonies. Its splendour was increased by the fact that the voices of the singers were accompanied not only by the organ but also by other musical instruments.

Thus, under the impulse and favour of the Church sacred music, in the course of the centuries, has made great strides, advancing to greater and greater perfection, from the simple and naive, but in their kind most perfect, Gregorian modulations, to the great and magnificent works of art, for the adornment of which not only the organ but other musical instruments serve. It was the study of the Church to make worship more splendid and more pleasing, but she was careful to exclude what was profane and alien to sacred worship.

This care of the Church is shown in the action of the Council of Trent and of many Pontiffs. The great Council wisely proscribed "those kinds of music, either of voice or organ, in which anything lascivious or impure was mixed." Among pontifical documents there is the cele-

brated Encyclical of Pope Benedict XIV (19 Febr. 1749). Therein, as the Holy Year of Jubilee was approaching, the Pontiff, with remarkable erudition and with a copious array of arguments, exhorted the Bishops to prohibit unlawful and immoderate abuses which had found their way into sacred music. The same way was followed by Leo XII, Pius VIII, Gregory XVI, Pius IX and Leo XIII. It was, however, St. Pius X who restored and reformed sacred music according to the principles and rules of ecclesiastical tradition, summing up the laws of music, as it were, in a code adapted to modern conditions. Music was also cared for by Pius XI in the Apostolic Constitution *Divini cultus sanctitatem* of Dec. 20, 1929. We Ourselves also in the Encyclical *Mediator Dei* (Nov. 20, 1947) enriched and confirmed the prescriptions of Our Predecessors.

II

Nobody will be surprised at this vigilant solicitude of the Church for sacred music. It is not a question of aesthetic laws or of technical rules in regard to this noble discipline. The Church's concern is to preserve music from anything that would render it less worthy, for music has a sacred importance inasmuch as it is summoned to serve in the performance of divine worship.

In this respect, sacred music obeys no different rules from those prescribed for all religious art and even for every kind of art. It is well known to us that in recent years some artists have, with offence to the piety of the faithful, introduced works of theirs into churches, of a type devoid of all religious inspiration and even repugnant to all right artistic rules. This deplorable way of acting they try to defend by arguments which, they say, flow from the very nature of art. They are continually claiming that the instinct which moves the mind of the artist must be free and not hemmed in by laws and rules alien to art itself. Moral and religious norms, they say, gravely injure the dignity of art by impeding and fettering the flow of genius.

These arguments raise a question of great difficulty and importance. The question regards all arts and artists, and is not solved by the principles of art and aesthetics alone, but must be decided in reference to the supreme principle of the last end, by which every man and every human activity is inviolably governed. The destination of man to God as his final end, is an absolute and necessary destination and direction founded in the nature and perfection of God Himself. It is so immutable that even God Himself could not exempt any one from it. Now, by this eternal and immutable law it is commanded that man himself and all his actions should manifest and imitate as far as possible the infinite perfection of God, for the praise and glory of the Creator.

Since man, then, is born for the attainment of this end, he must in every action conform himself to the divine archetype and direct all his faculties, both bodily and spiritual, mutually ordered in a becoming manner, to the obtaining of that end. Therefore, agreement with man's last end forms a standard of judgment by which art and artistic production must be judged. Art ruled by this standard is certainly to be numbered amongst the most noble activities of human genius, because it aims at expressing in human works the infinite beauty of God and is a reflected image of the divine beauty. Consequently that hackneyed phrase: "Art for art's sake," used as it wrongly is to claim for art exemption from all law not inherent in art, to the neglect of that end fixed in the nature of the creature, is either nonsense or a grave insult to God our Creator and Last End. The freedom of the artist—which is not a blind urge ruled only by caprice and the desire of novelty—in being subject to the divine law is not narrowed or destroyed but rather ennobled and perfected.

This truth regards all art, but especially religious art. Religious art, in fact, is more closely consecrated to the promotion of the praise and glory of God, its purpose being to touch the minds of the faithful through their eyes or ears and lead them to think piously of God. It is a great means of moving the soul to piety.

In consequence, an artist who does not profess the truths of the faith, or is intellectually and morally far from God ought not to set his hand to religious art at all. He lacks that interior eye necessary to see what the majesty of God and His worship require. It is not to be hoped that his works of art, empty, as they are, of religion, whatever skill they may show exteriorly, can be such as breathe that piety and faith which become the temple of God and its sanctity. They are not worthy to be accepted by the Church, the guardian and arbiter of religious life, for admission into her sacred edifices.

The artist, whose faith is firm and whose life is worthy of a Christian man, will be impelled by the love of God and will use religiously the powers granted to him by the Creator. He will strive by every means to express the truths which he holds and the piety which he cultivates. He will use his skill to the utmost in order to set forth beautifully and pleasingly by colours and lines and sounds and harmonic composition the religion which is in him, so that it is worship and religion for himself, the artist, and serves to rouse and inflame the people to profess their faith and cultivate piety. Such artists the Church has always honoured and will always honour. To them she opens wide the doors of her churches, recognising with pleasure what a service they are

doing for her by their art and industry, helping her as artists to exercise her apostolic ministry more efficaciously.

Sacred music is even more closely bound by the laws and norms of religious art, because it enters more fully than many others, like architecture, painting and sculpture into the actual performance of divine worship. Those arts prepare a worthy seat for the divine rites, but music has a principal part in the ceremonies themselves. Hence the Church must take every care that this minister, as it were, of the sacred liturgy be kept pure from everything that would be less fitting for divine worship, or would impede the elevation of the worshippers' minds to God.

Really, this is the dignity of sacred music, this its sublime purpose, to adorn with its beautiful modulations and its splendours the voice of the priest offering, or of the Christian people praising the Most High. Sacred music, by a certain innate power, lifts the minds of the congregation to God, it makes the liturgical prayers of the Christian community more lively and fervent, and thus all the faithful more strongly, more devoutly, more efficaciously praise and supplicate the Triune God. By means of sacred music the honour given to God by the Church joined to Christ her Head is increased; increased also are the fruits, which the faithful moved by the religious melodies gather from the sacred liturgy—fruits which the faithful show forth in lives and conduct worthy of Christians. This is what daily experience attests; and many literary monuments both ancient and modern bear the same testimony. This is what St. Augustine confesses of singing performed “with liquid voice and fitting modulation”: I find that by those holy words my mind is kindled more religiously and fervently when they are sung, rather than when they are not sung; and all the varying emotions of my spirit have modes proper to them in voice and song, whereby, according to some secret affinity, they become more living. (Conf. X, 33.)

Hence the conclusion that the dignity and power of sacred music increases in the measure in which it approaches nearer to that supreme work of Christian worship, the Eucharistic Sacrifice. Music can do nothing higher, nothing more sublime than accompany with sweet sound the voice of the priest offering the divine victim, voicing with joy the answers of the people to the invitations of the priest, beautifying the whole sacred action with its noble art. Next to this high ministry is that of the music which accompanies and adorns other liturgical actions and especially the recital of the divine office. To this liturgical music great honour and praise are due.

Nevertheless, great esteem belongs also to that music, which although not chiefly serving the sacred liturgy helps religion by its

themes and aims and is deservedly called "religious" music. Moreover, that kind of music, which is called "popular", and which owes its rise and development to the Church, is, as experience shows, a salutary means of edifying the faithful, whether it is used within the church in non-liturgical actions and ceremonies, or outside, in various solemnities and celebrations. The tunes of those songs, mostly worded in the vernacular speech, are easily learned and impressed on the memory; together with the tunes the words and sentences are retained in the mind, and by frequent repetition are better understood. Consequently, boys and girls learning those sacred songs at a tender age are greatly helped by them. Through them they grasp, relish and retain the truths of faith, with no small advantage to the work of catechetical instruction. In the case of adolescents and adults those religious songs entertain, recreate, and provide delights that are pure and chaste. In congresses and such gatherings they contribute a certain religious magnificence and within the domestic walls they provide pious joy and sweet consolation. They help the spiritual life of the family. On account of their utility to the catholic apostolate these songs or hymns should be carefully fostered.

Since the value of sacred music is such, all those who exercise this noble art in any capacity exercise an apostolate and shall receive the reward and honours due to apostles.

III

The excellence of sacred music demands that it should be surrounded with all corresponding favour and care.

First place belongs to that music which is immediately associated with liturgical worship. This music, as St. Pius X wisely reminded us, "must have certain qualities proper to it, and primarily sanctity and excellence of form—another note it should consequently possess is universality."

Sanctity, excluding everything which savours of the profane, is especially a mark of Gregorian chant, which is, as it were, a special patrimony of the Church. This chant wonderfully brings out the meaning of the liturgical texts and seasons them with sweetness. Its melodies are simple, but of such consummate art that experts have admired them in all ages, and they are an inexhaustible source of new compositions. This sacred treasure must be zealously guarded and abundantly dispensed to the Christian people. St. Pius X and Pius XI wished it to be widely propagated and diligently practised. New compositions for new feasts should be modelled on the genuine Gregorian melodies.

The quality of excellent art certainly belongs to Gregorian chant. Likewise universality, for it is the chant inseparably connected with the Latin words of the Roman Liturgy. In language and chant pastors of souls should recognise that the conservation of unity and universality should not diminish but grow from day to day. Even where custom allows the singing of vernacular words in the liturgy of the Holy Sacrifice, the law of singing the liturgical texts only in Latin should be strictly observed.

It is well to say briefly that the Roman Church greatly treasures also the chants of other ancient rites and especially the chants of the Oriental churches, now being, as it were, selectively codified in Rome by the united labours of the Papal Institute of Oriental Studies and the Papal Institute of Sacred Music.

Besides Gregorian chant, polyphony also, especially as represented by the supreme masters of the sixteenth century and their modern emulators has special honour in the Church "which", as St. Pius X said, "has constantly desired the progress of the arts and has constantly favoured them, admitting to the use of religion everything that the mind of man has found in the realm of the good and the beautiful, throughout the centuries, in accordance however with the laws of the liturgy."

Thus although the organ is the ecclesiastical instrument of music par excellence, other instruments are admitted within the measure of dignity, especially the wonderful instrument commonly called the violin. Modern types of music also are admissible in the measure of liturgical decorum.

Popular hymns with simple tunes and simple words have their place also. Though not allowed, without special permission of the Holy See, at High Mass, they serve very well to increase the devotion of the people at Low Mass. They should, however, be chosen to suit the special part of the Mass at which they are sung. Hymn-singing, the Pope says, should be encouraged, and can be used with great freedom in extra liturgical functions.

Although in Mission territories all cannot be carried out as in firmly established Christianities, missionaries will not fail to appreciate the great help they can derive from the cultivation amongst the natives of religious chant.

IV

In this last short section advice is given to Bishops on the cultivation of ecclesiastical chant—a proper *Schola cantorum*, wherever possible, in cathedrals and, according to circumstances, in other major churches—the teaching of sacred music and chant in seminaries and

religious houses of study—the sending of gifted students to Rome—the securing of a musical expert in the diocesan council of Sacred Art—the use and encouragement of societies for the cultivation of sacred music.

Music is a great help to a Christian life and the Holy Father would like to see it spread, voicing his wishes in the words of St. Cyprian to Donatus: "Let a sober banquet resound with psalms; and since your memory is good and your voice tuneful, undertake this work in your usual way: you are really feeding very dear ones. If spiritual hearing is given to us let religious sweetness delight the ears."

SUPREME SACRED CONGREGATION OF THE HOLY OFFICE

Wednesday, Dec. 7, 1955

In a general meeting of the S.S.C.H.O. the Cardinals entrusted with the safeguarding of faith and morals condemned and ordered to be inserted in the Index of Prohibited Books three works written by Dr. A. Hesnard.

1. *Morale sans péché*, Presses Univ. de France, Paris, 1954;
2. *L'univers morbide de la faute*, *ibid*, 1949;
3. *Manuel de sexologie normale et pathologique*, Payot, Paris, 1951.

The Decree of Their Eminences was confirmed by the Holy Father on January 10, 1956, and it was published on Jan. 23, 1956.

Wednesday, Feb. 8, 1956

The Cardinals of the Holy Office condemned on the above date and ordered to be inserted in the Index a book entitled:

Aldo Capitini, *Religione Aperta*, Guanda, 1955.

Having received the confirmation of the Holy Father on the 9th of the same month and year, the Decree was published on February 11, 1956.

W. LEONARD.

The Scriptural Controversy Between St. Jerome and St. Augustine

INTRODUCTION

The correspondence between St. Jerome and St. Augustine is one of the most celebrated of all times.¹ On literary grounds alone, St. Jerome's letters can claim proud company with those of Cicero, Seneca, and Pliny.² For the profane scholar, the letters of St. Jerome, particularly, and St. Augustine are treasure houses, where rare and valuable gems of historical and associated information are to be found. For the Christian, a correspondence between two such giants of the Western Church is a providential blessing.

Eighteen letters passed between them, nine from the pen of each. Chronologically, the letters fall into two periods. Ten letters were written between 394 and the end of 404, or the beginning of 405. After a lapse of some seven years, the correspondence was re-opened and between 411 and 418, the eight remaining letters appeared.

A division in content corresponded to the chronological. Between 394 and 405, the letters were given over to a Scriptural controversy; they reflect some of the bitterness inseparable from debate between men, however saintly. Two main matters were discussed in this phase: (a) the authority of the Septuagint, and the value of St. Jerome's new translation from the Hebrew; (b) the disagreement between St. Peter and St. Paul as narrated in Galatians, Ch. 2, 11-14. By the time of the second set of letters, St. Jerome and St. Augustine were warm friends. There

¹*Bibliography.* Schmid, J., SS. Eusebii Hieronymi et Aurelii Augustini Epistulae mutuae, Bonnae, 1930. This text reproduces the critical editions of Hilberg and Goldbacher in the CSEL series, with few exceptions. We have used this edition for all references to the letters, indicating it by S. We have been forced to use Migne for all other references even when a critical CSEL is available. Cavallera, F., S. Jérôme, Paris, 1922, especially T.1 pp. 297-306, and T.2, pp. 47-56. Cf. art. by same author in *Encic. Cattolica*, VI, p. 657. Cayré, F., *Patrologia*, I. Roma, 1936 (Ital. trans.), pp. 600-602. Labriolle, P. *History and Literature of Christianity*, N.Y., 1925 (Eng. trans.), pp. 356-360. Lagrange, M.J. *L'esprit traditionnel et l'esprit critique à propos des origines de la Vulgate*: in *Bulletin de Littérature Eccles.*, (1899), 37 ff., reproduced in: *Mélanges d'Hist. Relig.*, S. Augustin et S. Jérôme à propos des origines de la Vulgate. Malfatti, E., *Una controversia fra S. Agostino e S. Girolamo*, in: *Scuola Cattolica*, (1921), pp. 321-338, 402-406. Tourscher, F.E., *The Correspondence of St. A. & St. J. — A Study*, in: *Amer. Eccl. Rev.*, LVII.5 (Nov. 1917), pp. 476-492. Cunningham, J. G., *Letters of St. Augustine*, Edinburgh, 1872. Shaw, J. F., *On Christian Doctrine*, Edinburgh, 1885. *Basic Writings of St. Augustine*, Ed. by Whitney J. Oates, 2 Vols. New York, 1948. Fremantle, W.H. *The Principal Works of St. Jerome*, in *A Select Library of Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers*, Sec. Series, Oxford, 1895; and *Life and Works of Rufinus*, with Jerome's Apology against Rufinus, Vol. 3 of same series, indicated as N.P.N.F.

²Cl. Wright, F.A., *St. Jerome, Select Letters* (Loeb Classical Library), London, 1954, p. xiii.

is no trace of ill-feeling in this series of letters, and, indeed, St. Jerome hardly enters into discussion with St. Augustine at all, about his enquiries concerning: (a) the origin of the human soul, and (b) the correct interpretation of St. James, Ch.2,10.

The main principles at stake in the discussion dealt with in this first instalment of our article are, we feel, of perennial significance. In an age, which has already been favoured by our present Holy Father, with a new Latin translation of the Hebrew Psalter, and in which many look forward, with hope, to the completion of a noble Scriptural venture, these principles will have, perhaps, great directive and instructional value.

BACKGROUND.

I. ST. AUGUSTINE'S ATTITUDE TO THE SEPTUAGINT

For A., as for his world, the LXX was THE text of Sacred Scripture. It was held in a special reverence and awe, and enjoyed a unique and supreme authority, which it is not easy for us to appreciate. There were a number of reasons for this. Firstly, there was the memory of its extraordinary origin. The story of the seventy-two scribes, who at the end of their seventy-two days labour, produced an identical translation, in Greek, of the Old Testament,³ made a tremendous impression on the Fathers of the Church.⁴

A. believed that the Septuagint was a divinely inspired translation. The unanimous agreement of the Seventy must, he felt, be explained "because in very deed, the one Spirit had been in them".⁵ What was more, the divine inspiration produced, not only those sections, which reflected faithfully the original text; divine inspiration explained *everything* in the LXX. Even the additions and the omissions of the Seventy were divinely inspired. They appeared because the Holy Spirit had prompted the Seventy, as prophets, as his instruments, to do so. "They could omit or add something, so that even by this it might be shown that there was in this work, not human bondage, which the translator owed to the words, but rather divine power, which ruled and filled the mind of the translator".⁶

It is no exaggeration to say that for A., as for practically all his contemporaries, the *whole* of the LXX was regarded as divinely inspired

³Cf. De Civ.Dei, 18, 42 (PL.41,603); Ep.28 (A), 2,2, (S. p.29, 4-7).

⁴Cf. De Doct. Chr. 2, 15, 22 (PL.34, 46). Their testimonies have been collected by P. Wendland in the appendix of: *Aristeae ad Philocratem epistula cum ceteris de origine versionis LXX interpretum testimoniis*, Lipsiae, 1900; cf. Höpfl-Gut, *Introd. in Sacros U.T. libros compendium*, vol.I, Romae, 1940, p.293.

⁵De Civ.Dei, 18.42 (PL.41,603).

⁶De Civ.Dei, 18.43 (PL.41,604). A. did not, of course, forget that many errors in the LXX were due to the fault of the copyist. cf. De Civ.Dei, 15,13 (PL.41,453).

Scripture. Hence, it enjoyed divine authority in A's world. "The Seventy received so wonderful a gift of God in order that the authority of these Scriptures may be commended, not as human but as divine".⁷ It was because the LXX was divinely inspired that the Church, though there were other translations,⁸ received it as if it were the only one.⁹ Because of this, too, the best any other translator could hope to do would be to give a translation, which agreed with the LXX. Failure to do so would disqualify any other translation, and render it false. A., of course, believed that failure to do so would imply an attack on the authority of inspired Scripture itself. "Certainly, if any other interpretation of the Scriptures from the Hebrew into any other tongue is faithful, in that case it agrees with these Seventy translators, and if it is not found to agree with them, then we ought to believe that the prophetic gift is with them. For the same Spirit, who was in the prophets when they spoke these things was also in the Seventy when they translated them . . ." ¹⁰

But even the "minimists" would have had to admit, A. was sure, that if the LXX did not enjoy divine inspiration and authority, it could, at the very least, rightly claim a pre-eminent and undisputed authority. "Even if (the Seventy) *conferred together* with the result that a unanimous agreement sprang out of the common labour and judgment of them all, even so it would not be right or becoming for any one man, whatever his experience, to aspire to correct the unanimous opinion of so many venerable and learned men".¹¹ The combined authority of the Seventy was so great, even on this score, that no single translator, however skilled, could think of competing with, or attempting to supplant them. In whatever way the authority of the LXX was explained, therefore, A. could ask: "Who dares put anything in comparison with an authority like this, not to think of comparing anything to it?" ¹²

Besides these inherent qualities of the LXX, which compelled acceptance of its authority, there were extrinsic reasons, which confirmed it as the premier text of Scripture. The Apostles themselves had

⁷De Civ.Dei., 18,42 (PL.41,603). It is important to observe that A. was not disturbed by the fact that the Hebrew readings often differed from those of the LXX. He was sure that there could be no real contradiction in the two works, both inspired by the one Spirit. Though often accepting the Hebrew text as the better reading, yet he preferred the divinely inspired prophetic sense conveyed by the LXX, "as being more suitable for gentiles." Cf. De Doct. Chr. loc.cit.; cf. 4, 15, (PL.54, 96); De Civ.Dei., 15, 13 (PL.41,454); 15, 14 (PL.41, 455); 18, 44 (PL.41, 605).

⁸i.e., Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, and even J. cf. de Civ. Dei (l.c.); De Doc Chr., 2, 15, 22 (l.c.).

⁹De Civ. Dei., l.c.

¹⁰De Civ. Dei. 18, 43, l.c.

¹¹De Doct. Chr., 2, 15, 22 (l.c.); cf. De Civ. Dei, 18, 43 (PL. 41, 603-604).

¹²De Doc. Chr., l.c.

quoted from it in their proofs from Scripture. If, therefore, it was good enough for them, who will take objection to it, or wish to supplant it? Will all not imitate, in this practice, the Apostles who used it, and sanctioned it as Sacred Scripture?¹³

Finally, as far as A. is concerned at any rate,¹⁴ there were strong practical reasons for upholding the authority of the LXX. A new version for public reading would disturb the faithful and cause them anxiety, if not scandal. For they had a strong attachment to the LXX, which their ears and hearts had become accustomed to hearing, and which they, too, believed had been given the seal of approbation by the Apostles themselves.¹⁵ Besides, friction would surely ensue between the Latins and the Greeks,¹⁶ "most of whom (Greeks) are not aware that there is any other translation besides the LXX".¹⁷ The good of the Church and christian charity, therefore demanded that no innovations be introduced.

II. ST. JEROME'S CONVICTION ABOUT THE NEED FOR A NEW TRANSLATION

By the time of A.'s first letter (Letter 28) to J. in 394 or 395, the Great Doctor had been engaged for some four or five years on his monumental translation of the Old Testament from the Hebrew.¹⁸ His decision to break with the LXX had not been an unconsidered nor hurried one. For years in fact, the conviction had been growing within him that, in view of the shortcomings of the LXX and the Latin translations from it, it was imperative to return to the Hebrew original, if the Christians were to enjoy the advantages of a satisfactory version of the word of God.¹⁹

¹³De Civ.Dei, 15,14 (PL.41,455); idem. 18,44 (PL.41,605); Rufinus, Apol.adv.Hier., 2, 32-35 (PL.21, 611-614).

¹⁴Cf.Rufinus, o.c., 2,24, (PL.21, 602-603), 3,35 (PL.21, 613-614). A., however, seemed sceptical about the possibility or intention of the Jews of tampering with the text of Scripture. cf. De Civ.Dei, 15,11 (PL.41, 450), and 15,13 (PL.41,452-455).

¹⁵Cf. Ep.82 (A.), 5,35 (S.p.93, 13-15).

¹⁶Cf.Ep.71 (A.), 2,4 (S.p.42, 17-22).

¹⁷De Civ. Dei, 18, 43 (PL. 41,605).

¹⁸Jerome's activity as a Scripture translator covers three periods of his life. At Rome, 382-385, he revised the Gospels (Pref. in 4 Evan. PL.29, 525-530), and, most probably, the whole of the N.T. He revised, too, the Psalter from the "Common edition" of the LXX (Roman Psalter). Immediately after settling in Bethlehem in 386, he began translating or more exactly, correcting, the O.T. from the Hexaplaric LXX. In the famous fifth column of the Hexapla, seen by J. at the library in Caesarea, Origen had placed critical signs: the asterisk, to indicate what was to be found in the Hebrew but not in the LXX, and added to the LXX from Theodotion's O.T. Greek translation; the obelus, to indicate what was in the LXX, but missing in the Hebrew. In this period, J. revised the Psalter (the Gallican), Job, and indeed, all the O.T. books, Letter 134 (A.), (S.p.123 11-14). With the exception of the two above-mentioned books, and a few other fragments and prefaces, this work has been lost. The translation from the "Hebraea veritas" began in 390.

¹⁹Cf.Pref. in Interp. Chron., Euseb, PL.27, 35-38.

By 394, and especially by 403, when, with receipt of Letter 71 (A.), J. also received the oft solicited copies of Letters 28 and 40, he was adamant in believing that there was no solid reason for abandoning the venture on which he had embarked.²⁰ On the contrary, the critical awareness of the scholar and the scripturist determined him²¹ to push ahead with his work, despite bitter,²² unfair,²³ and often illogical opposition.²⁴

His decision had most compelling reasons to commend it, J. explained. The existing translations were faulty on many counts. The current texts omitted many passages dealing with Messianic prophecies, as well as much which Our Lord, the Apostles, and the Evangelists, cited as Scripture. Where, in fact, could one find, J. enquired, such texts as "Out of Egypt I called my son" (Os., 11,1, Mt. 2,15), "They shall look upon him whom they have pierced" (Zach. 12, 10, Jn, 19,37), if not in the Hebrew?²⁵ If appeal to the Apostles' practice could be used to bolster the authority of the LXX, it could be used with equal or better right, J. argued, for the Hebrew²⁶.

Then a comparison between the translations of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion²⁷ on the one hand, and the texts then in existence, on the other, supplied abundant evidence of variant readings. Surely this consideration at least should cause some questioning as to the value of the LXX translation²⁸. In consequence Christians were at a disadvantage, from an apologetical point of view, in debate with the Jews, because of such a state of affairs, and J. was convinced that the position could only be righted—and was in fact being righted—by some such undertaking as his own²⁹.

²⁰Nor can there be any doubt that in the main J.'s decision to correct the LXX and other Greek versions by the Hebrew was right. However, he was perhaps not fully aware, as has since been made clear, that there were variant readings in the Hebrew itself and that these may sometimes be corrected by the LXX, which was made from older copies. We are not concerned here with the question of J.'s attitude towards the Deutero-canonical books of the O.T., which were not in the Hebrew canonical Scriptures.

²¹Cf. Pref. in Ezram, PL.28,1406: "The serpent may hiss and victorious Sinon hurl his brand of fire. But never shall my mouth be closed. Cut off my tongue, it will still stammer out something."

²²Cf. Pref. in Job, PL.28,1082.

²³Cf. Ruf., *Apol. adv. Hier.*, 2,32-36 (PL.21, 611-615).

²⁴Cf. Pref. in Job, PL.28,1079-1080.

²⁵Cf. Pref. in Gen., PL.28, 149-150; *Apol. adv. Ruf.*, 2,34 (PL.24, 455-456).

²⁶Cf. Pref. in Paral. PL.28,1326; Pref. in Gen. l.c.; Pref. in Ezram. PL.28,1404.

²⁷It is hardly necessary to mention Origen's Hexapla which clearly shows the defects and superfluities of the LXX. cf. Pref. in Gen., PL.28,148.

²⁸Cf. Pref. in Quacst. Hebr., PL.23,933, 938; cf. Pref. in Esther, PL.28,1433: "The version then in common use (the vulgate LXX) is drawn out into all kinds of perplexing entanglements of language": cf. Pref. in Interp. Chron. Euseb., PL.27,33-37.

²⁹Cf. Pref. in Is., PL.28,774; *Apol. adv. Ruf.* 3,25 (PL.24,476).

J. knew only too well that the fundamental cause for opposition to, and misunderstanding about, his translation arose from the almost universal belief in the divine inspiration of the LXX. There was no hope for real textual advance in the Scriptures, unless this belief was re-examined. And re-examination showed that the belief was a fable³⁰. Though the LXX was certainly to be regarded with veneration, and appreciated as a remarkable translation, yet it was still a human translation, and liable, therefore, to the failings inseparable from any human work³¹. There was every reason, J. felt, for making his humble gift to the Tabernacle of God³²; those who represented him as censuring the LXX by his translation did him a grave injustice. Really, J. was sure, no one could point a finger at him in this connection³³. It was not his aim in producing the new to destroy the old³⁴.

If this decision to translate from the Hebrew reflected a courageous departure from the traditional attitude towards the LXX, J. felt fortified in taking that step by appeal to the practice of the Church. In point of fact, the Church had, J. pointed out, given no final sanction to the LXX, for Theodotion's version, and not the LXX, was read in the Churches³⁵.

But in the ultimate analysis, J. knew that in translating from the Hebrew he was only *completing* a process, which so many of those who objected to his work, already admitted *in principle*, by adopting in part. For the copies of the Scriptures which they used—even for liturgical purposes³⁶—were marked with asterisks, indicating the additions made from Theodotion through Origen's Hexapla. His detractors, therefore, must be consistent. They "must learn either to

³⁰Cf. Pref. in Gen., PL.28,150: "et nescio quis primus auctor septuaginta cellulas Alexandriae mendacio suo exstruerit . . ." Earlier, J. had accepted the theory of the divine inspiration of the LXX. cf. Pref. in Paralip.iuxta LXX, PL.29, 423-426.

³¹Cf. Pref. in Gen., PL.28,151.

³²Cf. Pref. in Gen., PL.28,148. For J.'s confidence in his ability as a translator of Hebrew, cf. Pref. in Gen., PL.28,152; Pref. in Job, PL.28,1083-1084: "Let those who will keep the old books with their gold and silver letters on purple skins, or to follow the ordinary phrase, in 'uncial letters', loads of writing rather than manuscripts, if only they will leave me and mine our poor pages and copies which are less remarkable for beauty than for accuracy."

³³Cf. Ep.57, ad Pamm., PL.22,577; Pref. in Libros Sal., PL.28, 1243-1244; Apol.adv. Ruf., 2,24 (PL.24,477): "Am I likely to have said anything derogatory to the LXX whose work I carefully purged from corruptions and gave to Latin readers many years ago, and daily expound it at our conventual gatherings; whose version of the Psalms has long ago been the subject of my meditation and my song? Was I so foolish as to wish to forget in my old age what I had learned in my youth. All my treatises have been woven out of statements warranted by this version. My commentaries on the twelve prophets are an explanation of their version as well as my own . . ."

³⁴Cf. Pref. in Libros Sal., PL.28,1243,1244; Pref. in Gen., PL.28, 147.

³⁵Cf. Pref. in Dan., PL.28, 1291; Pref. in Jos., PL.28,464.

³⁶Cf. Ep.57, ad Pamm., PL.22,577. Not only were they marked with asterisks, but even with obeli too! Cf. h.l.; cf. Pref. in Jos., PL.28,464.

receive altogether, what they had in part admitted, or they must erase my translation, and at the same time their own asterisks"³⁷. Indeed, the principle admitted, there was every reason why the translation of a conscientious and fully equipped christian scholar should be preferred to the "judaizing heretics, who by their deceitful translation, have concealed many of the mysteries of salvation"³⁸.

CORRESPONDENCE

The correspondence between St. Jerome and St. Augustine, dealing with the two controversial scriptural subjects, opened in 394 or 395 with A.'s Letter 28. It was an eventful and instructive correspondence—to say nothing of its fascination. Authentic copies of Letter 28, and A.'s second letter, 40, written in 398, did not, as a result of a series of unusual and unfortunate mishaps³⁹, reach J. until nine years after their composition⁴⁰. Reports of their fate, and copies of them, or at least of Letter 40⁴¹ reached J. by the Deacon Sisinnius⁴², and J., though professing not to believe that A. was their author⁴³, reacted as though he did⁴⁴—and to this A. took strong objection⁴⁵.

J. was naturally pained and resentful because he had not seen the letters, "which had come to everyone except himself to whom alone they were ostensibly sent"⁴⁶, and because to J., ever jealous of his orthodoxy, they seemed to imply a condemnation of his views. Though A. repeatedly requested an answer—in Letter 67, Letter 71, and even in Letter 73—to the questions the letters posed, it was not until the second half of 404, upon receipt of Letter 71, and authentic copies of Letters 28 and 40, that J. felt inclined to comply.

In the meantime, other letters had been written by both parties. In Letter 102 (a.402), J. replied in strong language, but with obvious efforts at self restraint, to Letter 67; in this letter A. had disclaimed authorship for a letter or "book" attacking J.. Letter 105 (a.403-404) was a bitterly sarcastic, sceptical, and at times, vehement, letter, provoked, most likely by a letter now lost, but closely resembling Letter 67.⁴⁷ At times, the relationship was most strained and at near breaking

³⁷Cf. Pref. in Job, PL.28,1079-1080.

³⁸J.'s opinion of Aquila varied, cf. references in N.P.N.F., Vol. vi, p.488, n.2.

³⁹Cf.Ep.40(A.), 5,8 (S., 36,13-14); Ep.67(A.), 2,2 (S.,38,17-20); Ep.71 (A.),1,2 (S., 41,15-25); Ep.73 (A.),2,5 (S.49,15-20); Ep.82 (A.),4,32 (S.,91,27-35) and 4,33, (S.,92,3-8); Ep. 102. (J.),1,1 (S., 39,2-3); Ep.105 (J.), 1,1 (S.44).

⁴⁰Cf.Ep.112 (J.),1,1 (S.53, 19-21).

⁴¹Cf.Ep.102 (J.), S.pp.39-40.

⁴²Cf.Ep.105 (J.),1,1 (S.44,2); cf.Ep.102, (J.) 1,1 (S.39).

⁴³Cf.Ep.102 (J.), 1,1 (S.39,13-16, 20-23).

⁴⁴Cf.Ep.102 (J.),1,1 (S.39,24-40,12).

⁴⁵Cf.Ep.73 (A.),1,1-2 and 2,3-4 (S.47-49).

⁴⁶Cf.Ep.105 (J.), (S.44,15-20).

⁴⁷Cf.Schmid, o.c., p.4.

point, and a repetition of the Jerome-Rufinus breakdown of friendship seemed inevitable. It was a tribute to the moderation, humility, and reconciliatory power of A., to which this correspondence is eloquent witness, that this tragedy between the two great Doctors of the Western Church did not take place. In a striking letter (L.73, a.404), A. poured oil on very troubled waters, and J.'s generous response was worthy of the great man. Though J. never said it in so many words, it is evident that his short and kindly letter (L.115, end of a.404 or beginning of a.405) was a reply to A.'s Letter 73. The correspondence closed with a very long letter from A. (Letter 82—a.404-405). This answered Letters 105, 112, 115. The conclusion of this last letter dealing with the scriptural controversy was typical of A.'s Christian charity and intellectual honesty. "Let us resolve to maintain between ourselves the liberty as well as the love of friends; so that in the letters which we exchange, neither of us shall be restrained from frankly stating to the other whatever seems to him open to correction, provided always that this be done in the spirit which does not, as inconsistent with brotherly love, displease God".

From the correspondence between J. and A. on the matter of the new translation and associated issues, J.'s complete mastery of the question, about which there was so much ignorance and confused thinking abroad, and his absolute confidence in his own attitude to it, emerge with impressive force. In the Galatian controversy, the tables may be turned, to some extent, at any rate. But here A. was the pupil. J. knew it, and at times showed it.

1. ST. AUGUSTINE'S ATTITUDE TO ST. JEROME'S NEW TRANSLATION

Augustine dealt with J.'s new translation in three of his letters—28, 71, and 82. J. explained the purpose and nature of his work, and vindicated it against what was really the ignorant criticism of A., in Letter 112; in two very brief passages in Letter 115⁴⁹ and Letter 134⁵⁰, he touched upon the matter again.

With an unwarranted self-assurance, A. advised J. to forget all about his translation from the Hebrew, and implied that J. was indeed presumptuous to have contemplated such a project. For J. could not be expected to make a contribution.⁵¹ It went without saying that J. could not improve on the venerable LXX translation—and his argument, A.

⁴⁸Cf. Ep. 82 (A.), 5, 36 (S. 93, 25-31).

⁴⁹Cf. Ep. 115 (J.), (S. 73, 25-26).

⁵⁰Cf. Ep. 134 (J.), (S. 125, 11-14).

⁵¹Cf. Ep. 28 (A.), 2, 2 (S. 28, 5-29, 14). J. fully understood A's line of argument, and in Ep. 112, 6, 20 (S. 69, 18), he put it bluntly, interpreting A.'s advice as meaning "don't waste your time."

felt, was unaffected by the acceptance of either a divine or natural explanation for the unanimous agreement of its translators. A. believed that this argument was so evident, that he hardly developed it.⁵²

For his present purpose, A. urged what he believed would be a more telling syllogistic argument. He would intimidate J. into abandoning his work. Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion were expert Hebrew scholars. Yet they had not been able to agree in their translations—and could, therefore, have been mistaken; besides they left much unsolved.⁵³ If this outcome was to be explained by the difficulty of the text, surely J. could never think that he would succeed where these experts had failed. If however the texts were plain, it was hardly likely that those accomplished Hebrew scholars⁵⁴ would not have been as much at home with them as J.. Why therefore, did J. think of pursuing an unnecessary labour? As is obvious, A. little appreciated J.'s outstanding ability in Hebrew, and J. was, with justice, offended by this lack of confidence in his scholarship.⁵⁵ A. on the other hand, was prepared to admit J.'s competence in Greek, and besought him to translate some of the Greek commentators of the Scriptures.

A. followed up this conclusive, as it seemed to him, line of argument, with an appeal to J.'s sense of christian responsibility. It was an appeal which sprang from A.'s anxiety, as a bishop, for the peace of soul of the flock and christian harmony; it reflected the current practice of reading extensively from the Scriptures in the Churches.⁵⁶ J. was exhorted to consider what annoyance and embarrassment his new translation would cause, and in fact had caused. Surely he knew it would lead to inevitable and bitter disagreements between the Greek and Latin Churches about the different Scriptural readings.⁵⁷ Lest J. should imagine that A. was looking for difficulties where none would arise, A. informed him of one such unhappy incident. It was a famous incident, and bears reproduction here, in its own right, and because of the insight it gives us into the early christian attitude to the Scriptures. "A certain Bishop, one of our brethren, having introduced into the Church over which he presides, the reading of your version, came upon a word in the book of the Prophet Jonas, of which you have given a very different rendering from that which has been of old familiar to the senses and memory of all the worshippers, and had been chanted for so many

⁵²Cf. Ep. 28 (A.), 2,2 (S.29,4-8).

⁵³Cf. Ep. 28 (A.), 2,2 (S.29,11).

⁵⁴Cf. Ep. 82 (A.), 5,36 (S.93, 25-31).

⁵⁵Cf. Ep. 112 (J.), 6,20 (S.71,11-16).

⁵⁶Cf. Ep. 71 (A.), 3,5 (S.42,31-33).

⁵⁷Cf. Ep. 71 (A.), 2,4 (S.42,17-22).

generations in the Church. Thereupon arose such a tumult in the congregation, especially among the Greeks, correcting what had been read, and denouncing the translation as false, that the bishop was compelled to ask the testimony of the Jewish residents (it was in the town of Oea). These, whether from ignorance or from spite, answered that the words in the Hebrew MSS. were correctly rendered in the Greek version and in the Latin one taken from it. What further need I say? The man was compelled to correct your version in that passage, as if it had been falsely translated, as he desired not to be left without a congregation—a calamity which he narrowly escaped. From this case we also are led to think that you may be occasionally mistaken".⁵⁸

Such disagreements there would always be of course; but they could be kept to a minimum, when unavoidable, and settled when they did arise, if the Latin translations were done from the Greek. The Greek original (*Graeco prolato libro*) could always be produced,⁵⁹ and because of the fact that "Greek was a language widely known",⁶⁰ the correct reading could readily be agreed upon. But what hope would there be of any such settlement, A. suggested, if the only arbiter was the Hebrew documents? For these would be difficult, if not impossible, to come by.⁶¹ Even if they were available, and supported the new translation against the LXX and the Latin translations done from it, A. was sure no one would be prepared to accept its authority or the Hebrew, in preference to the LXX and the translations done from it, especially when one remembered their widespread acceptance and its use by the Apostles.⁶² At any rate, J. should not run the risk of causing offence to the flock of Christ, by sowing doubts in their minds about the authority of the great LXX.⁶⁴

A. confidently took upon himself to advise J. how, if he must persist with translating the O.T., he could, in fact, make a contribution to the christian community. A. had been happy about J.'s translation of Job from the Greek. It fitted in very nicely with his own deep conviction about the divine inspiration of the LXX. For in this translation, J. had taken special care to insert the asterisks and the obeli,⁶⁵ which A. under-

⁵⁸Cf. Ep. 71 (A.), 3,5 (S.42,29-43,7); cf. Ep. 112 (J.), 6,21 (S.71,22-72,6). The uproar was over one word in Jonas. Ch.4,6, where J. substituted "hedera" (ivy) for "cucurbita" (gourd)!

⁵⁹Cf. Ep. 71 (A.), 2,4 (S.42,17-22).

⁶⁰Ibid.

⁶¹Cf. Ep. 71 (A.), 2,4 (S.42,22).

⁶²Cf. Ep. 71 (A.), 2,4 (S.42, 25-26): Quod si etiam perventum fuerit (ad Hebraea testimonia), tot Latinas et Graecas auctoritates damnari quis ferat?

⁶³Cf. Ep. 71 (A.), 4,6 (S.43, 14-19).

⁶⁴Cf. Ep. 82 (A.), 5,35 (S.93,9-14).

⁶⁵Cf. Ep. 28 (A.), 2,2 (S.28, 5-29,2); cf. Ep. 71 (A.), 2,3 (S.41,29-42,16).

stood,⁶⁶ — quite erroneously, as J. would later tell him (Letter 112) — to indicate what the divinely inspired Seventy had added (obeli) or omitted (asterisks) in their translation. For A., J.'s first translation of Job, with its critical signs represented in effect, a translation of the supreme LXX. This was the work to be continued, and that all the more so, since an exact Latin translation of the Greek LXX was desperately needed. "For the variations found in the different codices of the Latin text were intolerably numerous; and it is so justly open to suspicion as possibly different from what is to be found in the Greek, that one has no confidence in either quoting it, or proving anything by its help".⁶⁷ Indeed, to have begun such a laudable task, and then, without any apparent reason, as A. saw it, to abandon it and undertake a Latin translation, in which these critical signs were omitted altogether, seemed to argue to capriciousness.⁶⁸

II. ST. JEROME'S DEFENCE OF HIS NEW TRANSLATION

A.'s arguments would have deterred any man, who was not absolutely sure of his own position. J. most probably was the only man of his age, who, pioneering in such new fields, would not have found the imposing authority of A. too much for him. Though he was always respectful of A.'s episcopal dignity, he remained the courageous champion of truth, and answered A.'s propositions for what they were worth, in a long Letter 112.

He went, firstly, to the root of A.'s trouble: viz., that the LXX, with its critical signs, reproduced in J.'s translation of Job, represented the divinely inspired LXX with the omissions of the Seventy. "You must pardon my saying that you do not seem to understand the matter".⁶⁹ In the translation A. preferred, J. pointed out that he was translating from Origen's Hexapla. He explained that the signs had nothing to do with the divine inspiration of the LXX—which J. dismissed as a fable, as we have seen—but rather indicated what Origen added from the Hebrew from Theodotion, to the LXX (asterisks), or designated as being deficient in the Hebrew but found in the LXX (obeli). In reality, they indicated those sections, where the Seventy, because they were human translators, failed to do justice to the Hebrew text.⁷⁰ In the new translation, J. informed A., he translated from the LXX.

In practice too, J. hinted, A. showed that he did not understand

⁶⁶Cf. De Civ. Dei, 18, 43 (PL. 41, 604).

⁶⁷Ep. 71 (A.), 4, 6 (S. 43, 19-44, 1).

⁶⁸Cf. Idem, 2, 3, (S. 42, 6-12).

⁶⁹"... Pace tua dixerim—videris mihi non intellegere, quod quaesisti", Ep. 112 (J.), 5, 19 (S. 68, 28-29).

⁷⁰Cf. Ep. 112 (J.), 5, 19 (S. 68, 26-69, 9). J. gives reasons why the LXX omitted much, cf. Pref. in Gen., PL. 28, 150.

what he was talking about. "You wish to be an admirer and true partisan of the LXX".⁷¹ Yet A. read the LXX not in its "genuine form in which it was originally given to the world", but in the corrected, or rather corrupted, edition of Origen.⁷² Really, A. didn't read the LXX at all, J. asserted. A.'s practice had justified the logic of J.'s new labour. So J. suggested that A. read the translation of a Christian and not the editions of a man (Theodotion) "who after the passion of Christ was a Jew and blasphemer".⁷² Then with the ruthlessness of the scholar he added: "that you may indeed approve yourself a follower of the ancients (LXX), do not read what you find under the asterisks; rather erase them from the volume. If however you do this, you will be compelled to find fault with all the libraries of the Churches; for you will scarcely find more than one Ms. here and there which has not these interpolations".⁷³

In the last analysis, as J. wrote to A. a little further down, "I have laboured . . . to bring prominently forward those things which have either been omitted (*praetermissa*) or tampered with (*corrupta*) by the Jews (the LXX), in order that the Latin readers might know what was in the original Hebrew".⁷⁴ This was a positive contribution to the christian community. If it had only been realised that J. was not censoring or belittling the LXX—a work which he had translated into Latin⁷⁵—the relative advantages of both translations would have been better appreciated.

St. Jeromé made short work of A.'s syllogism, by means of which A. had hoped to show that J.'s work was unnecessary. With a neat *retorqueo argumentum*, he showed that, by his own standards, A. should have ceased all his expositions of the Psalms because his studies would have been quite useless. Indeed "on this principle, no one would ever venture to speak on any subjects after others had pronounced their opinion, and no one would be at liberty to write anything regarding that which another had once handled, however important the matter might be".⁷⁶

Finally J. vindicated his ability as a Hebrew scholar. A. was prepared to praise J's revision of the N.T. from the original Greek because he⁷⁷ and competent judges⁷⁸ had compared it was the Greek Ms., and discovered its worth. Why did he not adopt the same principle with regard to his Hebrew translation, J. asked him?⁷⁹ A.'s feeling that the

⁷¹Ep. 112, 5,19 (S.69,5).

⁷²Ibid. (S.68,35-69,2).

⁷³Ibid. (S.69,3-5).

⁷⁴Idem., 6,20 (S.71-2-4).

⁷⁵Cf. Ibid., (S.70,14-71,2).

⁷⁶Ibid., (S.69,10-70,13).

Jews could not have been trusted, or that they would not have been able or competent to give an opinion, J. ridiculed, at least as applicable to all Jews. Some would have been competent and honest enough to give a satisfactory answer.⁸⁰ In this connection he returned to the "gourd" discussion, and justified his use of "hedera" instead of "cucurbita." Then, not without a touch of humour, he concluded: "But if the Jews said, either through malice or ignorance, as you yourself suggest, that the word is in the Hebrew text which is found in the Greek and Latin versions, it is evident that they are either unacquainted with Hebrew, or have been pleased to say what is not true in order to make sport of the gourd-planters".⁸¹

CONCLUSION.

All in all, A. was but little convinced by J.'s knowledgeable exposition and defence. At the back of his mind, the divinely inspired LXX, with its long and hallowed use in the Church from the times of the Apostles themselves, loomed as the dominating colossus of the christian Scriptural world. He did give a sort of qualified approval to J.'s translation, in so far as it brought to light those things which had been either omitted (*praetermissa*) or perverted (*corrupta*) by the Jews.⁸² Still it was only qualified, for A. did not feel inclined to accept J.'s statement that the divinely inspired LXX translators had been guilty of any unfaithfulness, whatever doubts he may have been prepared to entertain regarding the Jews of the christian era. To his request for a copy of the LXX translation, J., significantly enough, failed to comply.⁸³

St. Jerome's translation had been born out of time, and what he was fully justified in believing "made him deserve well of his countrymen, the Latins".⁸⁴ was attacked, on almost all sides, as a dangerous, blasphemous and highly erroneous work. Little wonder, therefore, if Jerome was provoked to some bitter and uncomplimentary remarks about his critics.

⁷⁷Cf. Ep. 71 (A.), 4,6 (S.43,8-14). Concerning A.'s dislike for Greek, cf. Confess., 1,13-14 (PL.32,670-671).

⁷⁸Cf. Ep. 112 (J.), 6,20 (S.71,11-13).

⁷⁹Cf. *Ibid.*, (S.71,14-16).

⁸⁰Cf. Ep. 112 (J.), 6,21 (S.71,17-72,6).

⁸¹Cf. Ep. 112 (J.), 7,22 (S.72,7-73,2). Actually there was no Latin equivalent for the Hebrew word, which most likely meant "castor-oil plant". cf. Schmid, o.c., p.72, n.21-23. A., even after J.'s explanation of the matter, still preferred "cucurbita" because it was in "all our Latin versions, and because the LXX would not have rendered it gourd, had they not known the plant was something like a gourd". Ep. 82, 5,35 (S.93,16-18).

⁸²Cf. Ep. 82 (A.), (S.92,25-27).

⁸³Cf. *Ibid.*, (S.92,25-33). This Letter 82 contains A.'s famous tribute to the inerrancy of canonical Scripture, cf. 1,3 (S.75,12-18) and 3,24 (S.88,3-6). Some twelve years later, J. would refer to the request, and excuse himself from obliging because of the "grievous scarcity of scribes acquainted with Latin", and because the translation done from the Hexaplaric LXX had been lost through someone's dishonesty.

⁸⁴Apol. adv. Ruf., 2,24 (PL.24,447).

Most of them hardly understood what he was attempting to do, and hindered, without knowing it, the advance of genuine scriptural progress. Certainly, feasible and sincere objections—suffice it to read Rufinus, *Apol. adv. Hier.*, 2, 32-35⁸⁵—could be raised against the enterprise.⁸⁶ But there could be no doubt about the overall justification of J.'s textual revolt. J. himself never wavered, once he had made up his mind. The Church, history itself, and other controversies of a parallel nature, have proved how right he was. "In this great work of his life . . . Jerome showed a clear and matured conviction, and a noble tenacity, unshaken either by popular clamour or authority like that of Augustine".⁸⁷

H. G. DAVIS

(To be concluded)

⁸⁵PL.21,611-614.

⁸⁶It is to be noted that the many Fathers, who held the divine inspiration of the LXX, never taught that such an opinion was part of the deposit of divine faith. They never asserted that such teaching had been handed down by the Apostles. They were never, in this matter, "testes fidei". On the other hand, it was natural enough for them to assume, that the report of the LXX's divine inspiration was true. Everything seemed to point to it. The Apostles and Evangelists made use of it; a number of translations professing to be "God's word" had been made from it. The Jews had earlier used it as the Sacred Scripture in their Synagogues in the Diaspora. But all of this, as Jerome saw better than the others, proved only, that the LXX reproduced substantially the original inspired text, and as such was quite lawfully used as an authentic source of O.T. revelation. It did not prove that it was divinely inspired in the strict sense. Cf. Ep.57, (J.),11, PL.22,577-578) where J. points out the LXX rendered the sense of the original, even though it omitted or added much. "Yet the LXX *rightly kept its place in the Churches*, either because it is the first of all the versions in time, made before the coming of Christ, or else because it has been used by the Apostles (only, however, in places where it does not disagree with the Hebrew)". Note that this parenthesis was not borne out by the facts. cf.N.P.N.F. vol. VI, p.118, n.3. An almost parallel situation arose with regard to the Vulgate itself, some theologians maintaining that it was inspired.

⁸⁷N.P.N.F., p.xxx.

Archdeacon John McEncroe, X (1795-1868)

Summary: Some of Fr. McEncroe's activities in Ireland—Assists the Donegal migrants—Efforts to obtain priests, nuns, Brothers, lay teachers—Secures a Rector for St. John's—Perturbed by disquieting news from Sydney—Serious consequences of the 'Protestant Bibles incident'—Fr. McEncroe asks for appointment of Apostolic Delegate—Dr. Ullathorne appointed but asks to be excused—Fr. McEncroe returns to Sydney and is appointed to St. Patrick's parish—Departure of Abbot Gregory—Death of Fr. Therry—Destruction of Old St. Mary's—Fr. McEncroe presides at first meeting in connection with the new St. Mary's—Archbishop Polding describes the last scene.

The March winds of 1859 seem to have been more than usually severe and Father McEncroe, suffering intensely from their icy blasts as he journeyed north from London to spend a few days with his old friend and colleague Bishop Ullathorne, of Birmingham, found himself thinking almost continuously of the terrible plight of the hundreds of poor families on the west coast of Donegal, whom a short time previously a callous and heartless landlord had cruelly evicted from their peaceful homes and left to wander foodless and shelterless on the inhospitable mountains.¹ Before he left Australia he and Father Therry had been active members of a charitable and patriotic organisation established in Sydney and Melbourne to assist them. As part of the organisation's objective was to bring out as many as possible of them to the New Land of Opportunity, it may safely be assumed that Father McEncroe had been deputed to see the first contingent safely on its way. Thus we are not surprised to find him writing from Birmingham to the President of All Hallows: "I am on my way to meet the Donegal emigrants at Liverpool and to give them some advice on how to act when they arrive in Sydney. I am so glad that you were able to arrange for the Rev. Michael Flanagan to accompany them . . . I fear there is no use insisting on the chaplain's having unrestricted access to the sick on board ship, but by a little management with the surgeon he may get such access as may be necessary."

With each batch of migrants he had hoped to have included at least one qualified school teacher, carefully selected by the Spiritual Director of the Marlborough St. Training College, Father J. Power.² But although he had succeeded in persuading the Commissioners for Emigration to write to the Colonial Secretary in Sydney "stating that it was the wish of the Colonial Government to introduce into the Colony

¹In A. M. Sullivan's *New Ireland* the reader will find the story of those evictions graphically related in the chapter entitled "The Fate of Glenveih."

²This is the same Fr. Power who twelve months later accompanied Fr. Patrick Dunne on the Erin-go-bragh's nightmare voyage to Brisbane. (See A.C.R. Jan., 1950).

properly qualified teachers, and requesting that with this view passages for the families of teachers in the government emigrant ships should be provided if they, the teachers, were recommended in the manner pointed out by Archdeacon McEncroe," all sorts of obstacles were thrown in the way and much red tape had to be laboriously unravelled before six teachers with their families were finally allowed to embark.

Even more important, however, than the acquisition of so many hand-picked lay teachers was the finalising of negotiations with the Sisters of Mercy at Westport for six of their number to commence a foundation at Goulburn, where Father McEncroe's one-time assistant on Norfolk Island, Dean Walsh, was busily at work preparing the first house of the Order in N.S.W. But a fresh attempt, this time through President Woodlock, of All Hallows, to re-interest the Christian Brothers in the educational needs of Archbishop Polding's diocese proved as unavailing as before.

Priests, however, good, zealous, efficient pastors, were his principal concern, and so he set up his headquarters, where he thought they were most likely to be found, in the great new Missionary College of All Hallows. To the students and professors, who listened enthralled night after night to gripping accounts of his early experiences in the Colony, he revealed: "In my first letter from Sydney 26 years ago, I pointed out to Dr. Bramston, Vicar Apostolic of the London District, that the Colonial missions would soon be supplied with priests if there was a college in Ireland for that purpose . . . If circumstances permitted me to end my days in ever faithful Ireland there is no place where I would rather devote myself to the good of the Foreign Missions than in your excellent college." From the large number of eager students who wanted to enrol straightaway, seven were carefully selected, the zealous missionary making himself personally responsible for the maintenance of four of them and pledging Father Therry's name for two more. "In giving the sum of money you sent to Dr. Woodlock," he wrote to that most apostolic of all men, "I wished him to place a couple of students in your name for the Archdiocese of Sydney. I told him also that I was sure you would continue those subscriptions during the students' careers . . . If all the priests and professors in this college had not given their services *gratis* they could not have made the ordinary expenses of a student so very moderate."

From All Hallows, on the Feast of Our Lady Help of Christians, went forth his historic appeal, imploring the Bishops of Ireland to "take an interest in the spiritual welfare of their former flocks, now scattered over the extensive regions of Australia, and to feel an apostolic solicitude

in providing good pastors to guide those flocks and to break to them the Bread of Life."

MY LORDS AND MOST REVEREND FATHERS,—

As the vast majority of the Catholics in Australia are of Irish birth or descent, the Catholic Church of those important and flourishing colonies may be fairly regarded as a branch of the ancient and ever faithful Church of Ireland. And, as parents always feel solicitous about the happiness and success of their offspring, no matter how distant, so you, Most Rev. Fathers, whom the Holy Ghost has placed to rule the Church of God in Ireland, must take an interest in the spiritual welfare of the large numbers of your flock now located over the extensive regions of Australia, and must feel also an apostolic solicitude in providing good pastors to guide this flock, and to break to them the Bread of Life.

The Prince of Pastors has indeed watched over this remote portion of the vineyard, and produced much fruit therein, since the arrival of the first Bishop in New South Wales some four-and-twenty years ago. When His Grace the Most Rev. Dr. Polding took charge of the Australian mission, he found only two or three priests to attend to the spiritual wants of about 16,000 Catholics in all Australia. Now, praise be to God, there are seven or eight Episcopal Sees, about 130 priests, and at least 250,000 Catholics in the Australian colonies. But this number of priests is quite inadequate to the spiritual wants of so large a population, dispersed, as it is, over a territory fully as large as the half of Europe. Hence, the urgent necessity for a large accession to the number of priests, and of an adequate supply of Catholic teachers for the education of the rising generation. And one of the principal objects of my visit to Ireland, after an absence of twenty-seven years, was to make an effort to meet the religious and educational wants of the numerous Catholics of New South Wales, the first and the oldest of the Australian colonies.

In passing through England, I consulted on this subject with my old and esteemed friend the Bishop of Birmingham, who was himself one of the first and most efficient missionaries in Australia, and he (Dr. Ullathorne) remarked, 'that it was of the utmost importance to keep in view, that the missions in Australia must for a very long time depend mainly on Ireland for being supplied.' His Lordship also urged on me 'to remove, during my visit to Ireland, any unfavourable impressions that might exist in this country regarding the Australian missions.' And I am happy to be able to state, that such of the Bishops as I had an opportunity of speaking to, regarding the religious requirements of Australia, most kindly offered their co-operation in this regard.

His Grace the Archbishop of Dublin, whom I often met and consulted when in Rome, expressed his readiness to assist us as far as he could. The worthy successor of St. Patrick in the Primatial See of Armagh, His Grace Dr. Dixon, granted most cheerfully his permission to establish in the very Catholic town of Dundalk, with the full concurrence of the esteemed parish priest, the Very Rev. Dean Kieran, a house of the Marist Fathers for preparing religious of their society, and to train efficient masters for the Model School in Sydney, and for other schools in New South Wales. The Archbishop of Cashel addressed his clergy, assembled in conference, on the subject of my mission, and gave his permission to any of his priests who may feel called to go on the Australian mission. The good Bishops of Meath, Waterford, Kildare, and Leighlin, expressed themselves very favourably in behalf of these missions.

Thus, I hope to meet the views and wishes of the Archbishop of Sydney, as expressed in His Grace's pastoral, read last August in all the churches of that city, to the effect, that His Grace was most anxious to receive any well recommended priests, either secular or regular, into his diocese, as well as communities of religious orders devoted to the instruction of youth and the advancement of education.

As it will not be in my power to wait personally on each of you, Most Rev. Fathers, and to solicit your advice and co-operation in the object of my mission, I have been advised by one of your venerated body to address you by letter, and to beg of you to permit and encourage any of your subjects who may feel called upon to join the Marist Society at Dundalk, or to enter the Missionary Colleges of All Hallows and Carlow, where provision is made for educating clergymen for Australia. The priests, who have been already sent to Australia from these excellent colleges, have done incalculable service to religion in that country.

The same mysterious voice, the *Vox Hibernorum*, that spoke to St. Patrick of old, and said to him, on the part of our pagan ancestors, 'Come over, generous youth, and help us,' is again repeated by thousands of the children of St. Patrick in Australia, saying: 'Come over here, and carry on the glorious work, commenced by St. Patrick upwards of 1400 years

ago in Ireland. Come, you pious youths of Catholic Old Erin, propagate the same faith amongst us at the ends of the earth, and labour for our salvation.'

For, if a timely supply of good priests and teachers be not provided for Australia, we shall have to weep over the falling off of hundreds, if not thousands, from the faith in Australia, as we have had to witness in the United States of America, and all from the same melancholy cause, the want of good priests and competent schoolmasters.

But I hope for better things. For, when I contrast the present flourishing state of religion in New South Wales with what it was on my arrival in Sydney, in June, 1852, I can clearly discern the working of God's merciful Providence over the infant and promising Church of Australia.

Now, as to the means of supporting the clergy and competent schoolmasters, I may remark that a fair provision is made for the former under Sir Richard Bourke's memorable Church Aid, and that the sum of £7000 is voted for this year by the Colonial Parliament for the Catholic Schools of New South Wales. Besides, the Catholics in Australia are both well able and very willing to contribute to every object having in view the advancement of religion and of Catholic education. Witness the munificent sum of £22,000, raised in five months last year, by the Catholics of New South Wales, for the erection of St. John's College, in connection with the University of Sydney.

Recommending the Australian mission to your Lordship's pastoral consideration, and imploring your blessing on this distant portion of the Catholic Church,

I remain, my Lords and most Rev. Fathers,

Your very obedient and dutiful servant in Christ our Lord,

J. McENCROE,

Archdeacon of Sydney.

Meeting one day in the town of Clonmel a young priest, who spoke to him of the sad plight of many of his poor parishioners, Father McEncroe replied: Why not come with me to N.S.W.; bring out our homeless people and I will find them farms equal to any in the Golden Vale. And the young priest did not hesitate. Leaving all things, he followed him—and became, nine years later, Bishop William Lanigan of Goulburn.³

With regard to a Rector for St. John's College, Father McEncroe's intention seems to have been to secure a temporary one until such time as the Jesuits would be in a position to take over. Cardinal Wiseman, as we have seen, had hoped to procure for it "an Oxfordman of high literary standing, then professing at the Catholic University of Ireland." As all the Oxford men then at the University appear to have been laymen the question arises, Did Father McEncroe (and Cardinal Wiseman) contemplate a lay Rector for St. John's? However, the hope did not materialise, and while in Birmingham Father McEncroe sought the advice of Dr. Newman, who had only a few months previously relinquished the position of Rector of the Catholic University. Later still we find him consulting about the same matter Archbishop Cullen and Dr. Woodlock; and then in a letter from Templemore, dated 4th June, he informs Henry Bedford of All Hallows (a personal friend of Newman's) that he has "at last procured a competent Rector for St. John's."

³For the substance of this story, as indeed for much else in these pages, the writer is indebted to the series of brilliant lectures delivered from time to time to the Australian Catholic Historical Society by the Rev. N. McNally, B.A., of Sydney.

A remarkable thing about the new Rector, Father John Forrest, D.D., and one which was to prove a distinct disadvantage in the diocese of Archbishops Polding and Vaughan, was his long and close association with the Quinn bothers, first as class-fellows of James and Matthew in the Irish College, Rome, where their uncle, Dr. Cullen, was President; next as professor in Archbishop Cullen's University School in Harcourt St., where James and Matthew were President and Vice-President respectively, then as assistant to Canon Andrew Quinn in Kingston, and finally as friend and advisor to James and Matthew in Australia. Splendidly equipped, both by academic training and valuable experience of University life in Dublin, he nevertheless failed to lift St. John's out of the doldrums, and because he failed his services were but poorly appreciated and scandalously rewarded. As Bishop Lanigan of Goulburn pointed out on the occasion of Dr. Forrest's resignation in 1874, the failure of St. John's was due simply and solely to the absence of "feeder" colleges in the various dioceses. The common sense of Bishop Lanigan's remark is sufficiently proved by the fact that Archbishop Vaughan, who succeeded Dr. Forrest in the Rectorship, was not triumphantly successful either.

At the end of April, Father McEncroe visited some centres in the south of Ireland and as usual passed on to his old friend at Balmain such little bits of news as would be of interest to him. "I spent some time in Cork," he told him, "where a few of your surviving friends were very glad to hear about you. I gave a lecture on 'Australia' to the Cork Young Men's Society, in which I made mention of some of your early trials in Botany Bay. I met Mr. Justice Therry and Mrs. and Miss Therry, here recently; they are all well and gone to Killarney, where I also have been." When he writes again, from Templemore, to Mr. Bedford, of All Hallows, he is in a very serious mood; Killarney and the lighter side of life have been driven from his mind by very bad news from Australia "where something very untoward has happened since I left." The 'untoward' incident to which reference is here made was of course the incident of the Protestant Bibles, which has already been described more than once elsewhere. But in order to understand the real significance, from our present point of view, of that furious little storm in a tea cup, "that lamentable and melancholy tale" (as Mr. Plunkett so aptly called it), it is necessary to take our minds back once again to the year 1854, when Father McEncroe, as Vicar General, found himself called upon to administer the affairs of the diocese.

At that particular period the fortunes of the Sisters of Charity had reached their lowest ebb. With no certain home in Sydney and starva-

tion staring them in the face, they were preparing, as a last resort, to return to their old house at Parramatta when the new Vicar General, who had good reason to know their worth and plight—his own step-sister, Teresa Walsh, having died in the Order, literally from destitution, the previous year—rallied priests and people to their assistance. In response to his appeal a large and enthusiastic meeting took place in St. Mary's Seminary on Friday evening, 2nd February, 1855, "for the purpose of taking into consideration the best means for erecting a suitable residence for the Sisters of Charity and providing funds to enable them to extend and perpetuate their Order." From the seed thus sown sprang in due course (March, '57) St. Vincent's Convent and Hospital.

Into this abode of peace and quiet walked one fateful morning early in '59 the chaplain from Darlinghurst presbytery. Seeing some non-Catholic bibles and other books lying around, he spoke sharply to the Sister Superior (Mother Baptist de Lacy), snatched up the offending literature and strode out again. Immediately the fat was in the fire. Seven of the patients, rising up in indignation from their sick beds, departed; the honorary medical officer sent in his resignation. And John Hubert Plunkett, the mainstay of the institution, resigned not only his office of Treasurer at St. Vincent's, but also his position on the Board of Management of the Catholic Orphan School at Parramatta (conducted then and for many years by the Sisters of the Good Samaritan). Deposed from office by Dr. Gregory, Mother Baptist (the only then remaining in N.S.W. of the five pioneer Sisters who had come out with Dr. Ullathorne twenty years before) asked Dr. Polding's permission to return to her old convent in Dublin. The Archbishop not only refused his permission, but expressed strong opposition to her leaving N.S.W. Nevertheless she went, to the great sorrow of the general public, whose feelings towards her were well expressed by Mr. Plunkett: "From the first coming of that Christian woman her conduct has been most saintly. It rivalled that of many saints in the Calendar." Says the *Irish Annals of the Sisters of Charity*: "Dr. Polding resented the withdrawal of Sister M. Baptist exceedingly, and wrote a very strong letter to Dr. Cullen on the subject, claiming her as belonging to his Congregation. He also wrote to Rev. Mother, but as she had got Dr. Cullen's permission to remain, she left the matter to be settled between the two Archbishops." In point of fact, not only did Dr. Cullen give her permission to remain; he actually took her case to Rome personally, and when Dr. Polding wrote to him to complain about his action, "he did not condescend to notice the communication." The

breach of friendship between the two Archbishops was a sad sequel to the miserable affair of the Protestant Bibles; and as Father McEncroe happened to be in Dublin when Mother Baptist returned to that city he did not escape a certain amount of blame for what followed.

Then, as if all that was not tragedy and misfortune enough, there was yet another and even more humiliating development. To fill the vacancy on the Committee of Management of the Orphan School at Parramatta, caused by the resignation of Mr. Plunkett, Abbot Gregory had appointed a non-Catholic surgeon, Dr. Bassett. In ordinary circumstances such an appointment would no doubt have been considered a wise and diplomatic one, but coming as it did when tension between the Vicar General and many prominent Catholic citizens was already at breaking point, it proved to be, as one of them afterwards remarked, 'the very last straw.' Despite explanations by the Abbot, indignation continued to mount and on 26th February a meeting of 700 packed the Victoria Theatre "to take into consideration a series of resolutions respecting the recent nomination by the Rt. Rev. Abbot Gregory to a seat at the Board of Management of the Roman Catholic Orphan School at Parramatta . . . and to consider the present state of Catholic affairs in N.S.W." On the platform were such prominent Catholics as the French Consul (M. Sentis), R. O'Connor, Mr. Faucett, M.L.A., H. Deniehy, M.L.A., Mr. Butler, Mr. N. Loughnan, Mr. W. Loughnan, Mr. Heydon, "and other gentlemen generally active in Catholic affairs." The temper of the meeting will best be gauged by a glance at some of the resolutions passed:

"That it is neither safe nor creditable to the Catholics of N.S.W. to continue their confidence in an ecclesiastical administration of their affairs which could crown a long course of mal-administration with an act so repugnant to the simplest Catholic instincts.

"That until the ecclesiastical administration of Catholic affairs be committed to dignitaries of the Church in whom the community can have confidence, a provisional committee be appointed in whom shall abide the right and duty to nominate to government those members of the Catholic body they may consider best fitted to direct or guard their interests.

"That a report of these proceedings with a concise account of the progressive mismanagement on the part of our ecclesiastical authorities which led to them, be forthwith transmitted to Rome, with a reverential prayer that the Holy Father will see fit to extricate his children in this colony from their distressing embarrassment with all practicable speed."

Much else followed in the same vein and there was at least one

reference to the absent Archdeacon. "It was generally believed," said one speaker, "that the Venerable Archdeacon McEncroe was but little appreciated at St. Mary's and that he did not rest upon a bed of roses, but he was their best friend and best advisor. No sooner had he left them than they fell into the present blunder."

Thoroughly alarmed by reports of such a serious turn of events, Father McEncroe could hardly be blamed for asking the Holy See to send out an Apostolic Visitor. The request was made through Dr. Cullen, and the sequel may be read in the published *Letters of Archbishop Ullathorne*: "In the course of the autumn it appeared likely that a very responsible and difficult duty would be imposed on Bishop Ullathorne, by his appointment to act as Papal Delegate in Australia, where the affairs of the Colonial Church were in great confusion. Although persuaded that the business in question would be best carried out in another way, and keenly sensible of the peculiar difficulties which would attend his return to Australia in a position so responsible, he was nevertheless prepared, if called on, to obey. 'I am sure of this,' he writes, 'that if there is prospect of doing any important service to the Church, for which there is no other visible means, and if the Holy See strenuously urges this course, I must not shrink from the duty merely because it may be an unpleasant one . . . However, my impression is that I shall not go further than a brief trip to Rome.' So to Rome he proceeded some little time before Christmas; and the memorial he presented to Propaganda on the subject of the affairs in Australia resulted in the abandonment of the proposed plan of sending a Papal Delegate, and the adoption of a different course" (p. 101).

Briefly stated, the "different course" adopted by the Holy See was to order the removal of Dr. Gregory, and when Father McEncroe arrived back in Sydney in March, 1860, plans were already well advancing to farewell the departing V.G. To the aging Archbishop the banishment of his 'dear Gregory' came as a crushing blow, the wrenching off, as it were, of his right arm, and in the following lines, hurriedly dispatched to the Bishop of Birmingham, he did not disguise his feelings. After referring briefly to "the appointment of a Delegate—the latter dispensed with by your kind remonstrance," he proceeds: "In the meanwhile each post brings me letters from good priests expressive of their alarm. Not one—except Fr. McEncroe—who does not consider Dr. Gregory's retirement fraught with disastrous consequences. Fr. McEncroe thinks it quite as well that he should go. The Bishops of Melbourne and Adelaide feel that a sort of outrage has been committed on ecclesiastical propriety in the absolute removal of a V.G., his

Ordinary not being even consulted, and apparently there will be a strong remonstrance when we meet in Synod. This of course irrespective of the flood of dreadful evils which must follow from this yielding to an infidel schismatical press. To no purpose will it be alleged that the press had nothing to do with it. It is through the press that the Archbishop and Bishops of whom you speak have derived their information . . . When Fr. McEncroe acknowledged that he strongly urged the sending of a Delegate, I requested him to state for what reason he urged the sending of a Delegate so far. He could not assign a single substantial reason; he thought his presence might do good in bringing perfect unity in the Catholic body . . . I have every reason for concluding that had McEncroe been directed to return to his own diocese by the Holy See and the other measure I have mentioned carried out, the factions would have been forever crushed. I will not disguise it, that man has been one of the principal causes of all our troubles—with the best intentions before his mind . . . For I hold him more or less responsible for the *Journal* which for many years was his property. His parting words when leaving Sydney were publicly to recommend the public to support the *Freeman's Journal*."

An interesting footnote to the above is provided by our old friend John O'Sullivan, of Goulburn, in the course of a rambling letter⁴ to Father Therry (Feb., '61). "I send you," he writes, "a letter I got from Mr. Justice Therry the month before last. You will see from it that Dr. Gregory is not free from trouble. I had a letter from him (Dr. Gregory) by the same post. He states that he was informed Fr. Bermingham had proceeded to Rome, backed with letters from his Grace of Dublin, to complain of him. Fr. McAlroy says it is not so—Fr. Bermingham did go to Rome, but it seems it was to defend himself, the Archbishop having written him a letter which was handed to him the morning he sailed from Sydney and which was a prohibition against his return to the diocese."

⁴What really occasioned the letter was this: When Fr. Bermingham set out for Europe he took with him a group of particularly lively Australian youths with the object of having them trained for the priesthood at Carlow College. In the group (facetiously termed "The Twelve Apostles" and none of whom, by the way, ever attained the desired goal) was a son of John O'Sullivan. While in Sydney, on the way to Carlow, young O'Sullivan "spotted" an old grey horse that had been stolen some time previously from his father's property at Goulburn. With the aid of a policeman, he recovered the animal and then saddled poor Fr. Therry (for whom his mother used to house-keep long ago at St. Mary's) with the responsibility of looking after it. With regard to Fr. Bermingham, it may be mentioned here that having been forbidden by Dr. Polding because of some supposed intrigue to return to the Archdiocese, he bided his time wisely and having picked up a Doctorate in Rome secured a professorship in Carlow College, where he eventually became Vice-President. When Goulburn became a separate diocese the new bishop Dr. Lanigan welcomed him back, although requested by Dr. Polding not to do so.

In April, '61, the new Bishop of Brisbane reached Sydney. "Dr. Quinn of Brisbane," wrote the Archbishop, "has not yet come up. He and party were detained nearly a month in quarantine. A queer lot of clergy he has brought: four French, one Irish and one Italian—one of them between 60 and 70—without any letter to me, and making first for Dr. Forrest." But perhaps the Archbishop was slightly prejudiced. "Dr. Quinn of Brisbane" wrote his secretary, the convert parson, Mr. Mackinson, two days later, "is come and is gone with his four priests and seven nuns. He is rather a nice person and has won the measureless laudations that a new face and a totally good sized person are sure to receive in our community here. The Archbishop thought him rather reserved towards himself, but it struck me that he himself was rather cold and on the defensive towards Dr. Quinn. I am, as you know, no great judge of character and design, but as far as I could judge, I should say he had no feeling nor commission adverse to his Grace."

Because of the strained relations now engendered between him and his Superior, Father McEncroe was not required, on his return from abroad, to resume his old life at St. Mary's, but was appointed instead to the charge of the historic parish of St. Patrick, where a fine presbytery had recently been provided by Fr. Newman. Among the many who wrote to congratulate him on his appointment was a young student in Mount Melleray, whose financial difficulties on the road to priesthood were being taken care of jointly by Australia's first Archpriest and Archdeacon. The student was one J. J. Carroll, destined many years later to be Cardinal Moran's Vicar General. "I am sure you will be very comfortable," he writes, "for I heard they were building an excellent presbytery at St. Patrick's before I left Sydney, and besides I am of opinion that you never had even the common and necessary comforts of life at St. Mary's. You will now be less cramped for that room and liberty which your position so much requires." In this grand old parish, then, with its thousand-and-one venerable and hallowed associations and redolent with the memories of Father O'Flynn, William Davis, James Dempsey, Michael Hayes, and the other brave men who guarded Catholicity's cradle in the *dark age* of the Colony, Father McEncroe settled down to spend the few remaining years of his long and eventful life.

Some difficulties had arisen regarding the land adjoining the Church, but the zealous priest resolved to secure it at any price, as an invaluable centre for the institutions which he foresaw would one day be required for the ever increasing parochial work. "I am sure," he

says in a printed circular to his parishioners, "that every Catholic in Sydney would cheerfully give his mite towards securing for the Church the very site on which the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass was first offered on the shores of Australia, and where the Blessed Sacrament was preserved for months after the Rev. Father Flynn was so unfairly sent out of the Colony, and where the Catholics used to meet for prayer when there was no priest in the country . . . "

The death of Father Therry in 1864 was the occasion of unprecedented mourning, and those who listened to the faltering panegyric preached by his old friend at St. Mary's realised how strong yet tender were the bonds of fraternal love and affection which had always united them, as feelingly and beautifully he recalled the years that were gone—years of oppression, of labour, of self-sacrifice, when side by side, loyal and true together, they had stood up for the rights of the Catholic Church, had fought under the banner of Christ crucified, had tended the sick, visited the imprisoned and prepared the poor convict for the gallows.

Of the overwhelming disaster of the following year—the complete destruction by fire of St. Mary's Cathedral on 29th June—we shall not speak at length. One of the most heartening things about it was the practical sympathy at once displayed by all sections of the community. While the fire was still blazing a preliminary meeting, presided over by the old veteran from St. Patrick's, took place in the adjoining seminary, at which £6000 were subscribed and assurances given that a new and grander St. Mary's would arise from the ashes of the old. Six days later a great public meeting packed the Prince of Wales Theatre. The Archbishop presided and with him were the Governor and leading members of government. Again Father McEncroe was among the speakers. Feelingly he recounted the sacrifices made by the Catholics, and then went on to tell how it was they had been able to secure such a magnificent site for their Church.

But the grand old hero of the Cross was not destined to behold the splendours of the new edifice. Fourteen weeks before the blessing of the first stone was due to take place, and while the foundations were yet many feet below the surface, he had come to the end of his earthly pilgrimage. Another Temple, the one that is above, not made with hands, infinitely more glorious and indestructible, was ready to receive him, and thither he was called Home, on Sunday, 22nd August, 1868.

Let us not take from the old Archbishop the privilege of describing the last scene:

"You will grieve, but not as one without hope, I am sure, my dearest Gregory, when you learn that good Father McEncroe has breathed

his last. He has been breaking during some time, but yet kept on his work. He preached twice, I think, on the Sunday, celebrated Mass on the Tuesday after. In the evening he felt very unwell and so remained in bed on Wednesday, from which, indeed, he did not again rise. Congestion of the lungs set in; he was attended by Dr. Mackay. I visited him each day, and intimated a desire that other medical advice should be had, though I felt that the case was beyond all human remedy. So Nathan and Williams very readily gave their services. They held several consultations, but from the first considered the case hopeless. The dear good man was so patient. On Friday evening I proposed to him the receiving of the last Sacraments, to which he gladly acceded. He was perfectly conscious and answered some of the prayers. During the night the congestion went on rapidly, and so, during Saturday, it was evident that life was fast ebbing away. I was with him in the morning and returned after midday and continued with him. The prayers for the agonising were recited at intervals. About five or half past five the bishops came into his room; he was sensible of their presence and received their blessings. The remaining part of the prayers for the souls departing were recited, also a part of the Rosary. Then silence, and short prayers occasionally, and so, until half-past seven, when his purified holy soul obeyed the summons of its Creator and went forth to meet Him whom he had so long and so earnestly served. There was no agony, no struggle; as the congestion filled up the lungs, the power and means of breathing lessened, until the last gentle sigh and a sort of small spasmodic movement of the mouth gave proof that his mortal life had ceased. Never was there greater grief manifested over the death of any individual; far greater, I think, than for Father Therry, and so the funeral was the largest ever seen in Sydney. Therry and Father John are in the same vault. My time must now come; may I be as well prepared and have some, if not all, the consolations our dear friend received in his last moments. I gave him absolution just as life closed."

R. WYNNE.

THE END.⁵

⁵The articles by Father R. Wynne began in the January number of the A.C.R. (A.C.R., Vol. XXXI, Jan., 1954, p. 34) and were continued in subsequent numbers.

Dogmatic Theology

THE SACRAMENT OF BAPTISM IN THE LITURGY OF THE EASTER VIGIL

The liturgy of the Easter Vigil is a celebration of Christ's resurrection and our Baptism. There is an intimate connection between the resurrection of Christ and the regeneration of Christians. For Baptism of its very nature is a participation in the mystery of Christ's resurrection.

St. Thomas declares that the resurrection of Christ is both the efficient cause and the exemplary cause of our regeneration through grace. And the liturgy teaches the same truth in its own fashion. In the liturgy the dogmas of faith are presented, not in the austere and abstract manner of scientific theology, but in such a way as to nourish the minds and hearts of the faithful. The liturgy is theology translated into song, ceremony and prayer. In this article we shall outline the liturgy of the holy night, and see how the sacrament of Baptism is presented against the background of Christ's resurrection.

THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST

The mystery of Christ's resurrection is dramatically presented in three ceremonies—the blessing of the fire and the paschal candle, the solemn procession of the *Lumen Christi*, and the deacon's hymn of Easter praise—the *Exultet*.

a) *The blessing of the fire and paschal candle.* The Church begins the Easter Vigil by proclaiming the central truth of the gospel. Christ is risen from the dead. Our salvation is accomplished. This message of Redemption finds its first expression in the blessing of the new fire, which has been kindled by sparks struck from flint. On this ceremony the Church imprints a delicate symbolism which is indicated in the prayer of blessing. "O God, through thy Son, the true corner-stone, thou has enkindled in the faithful the fire of thine own splendour." Christ is the corner-stone, the flint, which has been struck with the rod of the cross, and has enkindled the fire of the Holy Ghost in the souls of men. It is through Christ, through the mysteries of his death and resurrection, that the benefits of redemption are communicated to men.

The liturgy now directs our attention to the paschal candle. On the wax surface the celebrant engraves the sign of the cross, the first and last letters of the Greek alphabet, and the numerals of the current year. He accompanies the actions with these words: "Christ yesterday and today; the beginning and the end; the alpha and omega; his are the

times and ages; to him be glory and empire, through all the ages of eternity. Amen."

The ceremonies and the words, which are directly applied to Christ, make the paschal candle the symbol of our risen Saviour. The Church impresses on our minds the close connection between the abasement of the cross and the glory of the resurrection. She acknowledges that the risen Christ has the rights of empire and kingship by a double title—by his birth in eternity as the Son of the Father, by the blood which he shed as the price of a kingdom. She sees the current year as dedicated to the eternal King, as stamped with the royal seal of the cross. Thus she proclaims the sovereignty of the risen Christ to each generation of Christians.

Five grains of incense are then inserted into the candle in the form of a cross. In the Middle Ages the grains of incense were considered as symbols of the wounds of Christ, and this meaning is preserved in the prayer. "Through his holy and glorious wounds, may he keep and preserve us, Christ the Lord. Amen." The risen Christ bears in his flesh the scars of the passion—trophy of his victory over death.

The celebrant now lights the paschal candle, and the accompanying prayer is full of significance. "May the light of Christ, gloriously rising, dispel the darkness of heart and mind." The ceremony concludes with the prayer of blessing. We now see before us the risen Christ, the light of the world, who has triumphed over the darkness of sin and death.

b) *The Lumen Christi procession.* The procession of sacred ministers moves into the church. Darkness reigns supreme. The only source of light comes from the paschal candle which is carried by the deacon. As he moves through the church he halts three times, and chants: "*Lumen Christi.*" At each halt candles are lighted. The celebrant is the first to light his candle, then the clergy, and finally the people, until the whole church is a blaze of light.

In this ceremony we see the risen Christ communicating his grace and light to all who wish to receive him. We see the gradual diffusion of the benefits of the resurrection throughout a world which is dominated by sin. We can form some idea of the cosmic effects of the Redemption from the little world of the parish church. The light of Christ gradually overcomes the darkness until the entire church is filled with the radiance of his grace and truth. But there is a second lesson to be learned from the *Lumen Christi* procession. The light of Christ is spread through the world by the hierarchy of the Church, through the pastors divinely appointed to preach the gospel of Christ.

c) *The hymn of Easter praise.* The paschal candle is set down in

the middle of the choir, on a small stand; and the *Exultet* is chanted by the deacon, who has been appropriately called the herald of the resurrection.

The central theme of the *Exultet* proclaims the glory of this night, in which Christ triumphed over death and sin. The church vibrates to the trumpet tones of victory, while heaven and earth are invited to rejoice in Christ's resurrection. "Let the angelic choirs of heaven rejoice; let the divine mysteries rejoice exultingly; and for the victory of this great King let the trumpet of salvation sound forth. Let the earth also put on gladness, being illumined by the rays of this glorious brightness: and enlightened by the splendour of the eternal King, let her know that the darkness of the world is scattered. Let our mother the Church also rejoice, adorned with the brightness of such great light; and let this temple resound with the triumphant voices of the people."

But the light of Christ's resurrection illumines the past as well as the present. The history of Israel, the mysterious events of the Old Testament, find their meaning and fulfilment on this night of resurrection. The Jewish pasch and Exodus from Egypt were the type and figure of the true Lamb, and of true deliverance from sin. Both testaments are honoured in the deacon's song of praise. "This is the paschal feast, in which the true Lamb is slain, by whose blood the door-posts of the faithful are hallowed. This is the night in which thou didst once lead our fathers, the children of Israel, out of Egypt. This is the night that through the brightness of a pillar of fire, purged away the darkness of iniquity. This is the night which at this time throughout the whole world separates them that believe in Christ from the vices of the world and the darkness of sin, bringing them back to grace and the fellowship of holiness. This is the night wherein Christ, breaking the bonds of death, came back victorious from hell."

The *Exultet* continues with its praise of this paschal night—the historic night which alone deserved to know the hour of Christ's resurrection. It concludes with a prayer that the peace of the risen Saviour may descend both upon Church and State.

In the early church there was no fixed text for the hymn in honour of the paschal candle. Its composition was left to the inspiration of the chanter; and we find a trace of this tradition in the prelude of the present *Exultet*. "I beg you, most dear brethren . . . join with me in invoking the mercy of almighty God, that he may make me fit to proclaim the praise of this candle."

During the Middle Ages the text was copied on long rolls of parchment, richly decorated with miniatures which illustrated the various

themes of the *Exultet*. The miniatures were so arranged that as the parchment was gradually unrolled, the faithful had before their eyes a series of brilliant pictures which helped them to understand the theme of the deacon's chant.

With the completion of the *Exultet* the mystery of Christ's resurrection stands fully revealed. The liturgy now turns to the second phase of our Redemption—to the mystery of our incorporation into Christ by the sacrament of Baptism.

PARTICIPATION IN CHRIST'S RESURRECTION

A) *The lessons.* The mystery of Christ's redemption is realised in the individual soul by the sacrament of Baptism. But first the Church holds a vigil service which is permeated with an atmosphere of expectancy, of waiting for the coming of Christ. Her paschal Vigil retains the structure of the ancient Roman Vigil, and consists in a series of scripture-readings.

The present lessons are selected from four passages of the Old Testament—the creation of the world, the crossing of the Red Sea, the messianic times, and the law of Moses. In all of these events the Church sees the clear outline of her own destiny and that of her members. History, once again, is interpreted in the light of Christ's resurrection.

The scripture meditations begin with the opening pages of Genesis. This first creation is the figure and promise of the new creation of grace. In the beginning man was created to the image and likeness of God; and in the sacrament of Baptism he is re-created to the image of the risen Christ.

The passage of the Red Sea is a figure of the sacrament of regeneration. For the Jews the crossing of the Red Sea marked the end of an era in their history. They were liberated from the slavery of Egypt, and their nation was reborn. Baptism, too, is the decisive event in the life of every soul. Through the waters of Baptism man is liberated from the slavery of sin, and is reborn to newness of life in Christ.

The reading from the fourth chapter of *Isaia*s contains a prophetic vision of events which are to happen in the days of the *Messias*. The Lord shall purify Jerusalem by suffering. The new Sion shall be holy in its people, fertile with life, and protected by God. The prophecy is applied to the Church, the new Jerusalem, which begets her children in holiness by the fertile waters of Baptism.

The final reading contains the exhortation of Moses to the Hebrew nation before his death. It is an appeal to the chosen people to persevere in fidelity, and not to abandon the law of God. For the members of the Church it is an exhortation to persevere in obedience after Baptism, to

be faithful to the ideal of the risen Christ who himself was obedient unto death.

The readings have a unity of theme and purpose. For the catechumen they are a last-minute instruction before receiving the sacrament of Baptism. For the faithful they are a reminder of graces already received.

(b) *The Litanies.* In the restored Easter Vigil the litany of the Saints is divided into two equal sections, so as to enclose the entire baptismal ceremony. The blessing of the baptismal water, the administration of the sacrament, and the renewal of vows are set within the framework of the litanies.

The litany of the Saints is the perfect prayer of a Church that is one, holy and catholic. It emphasises the invisible bond which unites the faithful on earth with the blessed in heaven. *Omnes Sancti et Sanctae Dei. Intercedite pro nobis.* It prays for deliverance through the mysteries of Christ, which are the source of salvation. *Per sanctam resurrectionem tuam. Libera nos Domine.* It implores God's help with the confident cry of *Abba, Father. Pater de coelis Deus. Miserere nobis.*

In earlier times when the candidates for Baptism were numerous, it was impossible for the congregation to attend the ceremonies performed in the baptistery. They remained behind in the basilica reciting the litanies, the common prayer of the faithful, repeating the invocations as many as seven times. The litanies now form an appropriate setting for the baptismal ceremonies of the restored order. By the sacrament of Baptism we are gathered into the communion of saints; we come into living contact with the mystery of Christ's resurrection; we truly become the children of God.

(c) *Blessing of the Baptismal Water.* While the first part of the litanies is being sung, preparations are made for the blessing of the baptismal water. A vessel of water is placed in the middle of the choir, in full view of the congregation, before the paschal candle. The celebrant begins the rite of blessing with a prayer which petitions God's presence at the administration of the sacrament. He is fully conscious that the power and presence of God are required to produce the effects of the sacrament. The generation of new life, the gift of divine sonship—these are effects which cannot be attributed to the natural properties of water, nor to the power of man. And so he prays: "Almighty and everlasting God, be present at these sacraments . . . so that what is done by our humble ministry may be accomplished by the effect of Thy power."

The long prayer which follows is modelled on the great eucharistic Preface—the prayer by which the bread and wine were consecrated in the early liturgy. Essentially it is a single prayer which petitions for the consecration and exorcism of the water. But the central theme of life-giving water is developed under different aspects, so we can divide the prayer into different sections.

(i) The preface opens with the prayer of consecration by which the water is prepared for its mysterious destiny of regenerating the human race. God briefly revealed to men his future plans for the created element of water by two events in the Old Testament. At the beginning of history the Spirit of God hovered over the waters, and they brought forth living things. In the sacrament of Baptism we find the same divine association of water and the Holy Ghost, bringing forth spiritual life. At the very creation of the world God seemed to indicate his far-off designs, to prepare the water for its remote destiny, sanctifying it by the presence of the Spirit. Again, in the times of Noah God chose the deluge as his instrument for purifying the world. The crimes of a guilty world, the vices of a race hardened in sin, were swept away in the flood waters. The human race was reborn in sanctity, springing from the generation of Noah. The flood waters were a figure of baptismal regeneration—the end of vice and the beginning of virtue.

This same element of water is to become the immaculate womb, the divine font, where a new race is conceived in holiness. And so the Church asks God to sanctify the waters of Baptism, to consecrate and prepare them for their divine mission. "Look, O Lord, upon the face of Thy Church and multiply in her Thy acts of regeneration. Make Thy city glad with the torrent of Thy abundant grace. Open also the fountains of baptism throughout the wide world for the renewal of nations, so that by the command of Thy divine majesty the church may receive from the Holy Ghost the grace of Thy only begotten Son. May the Holy Spirit, by the secret mingling of his divine power, give fecundity to this water prepared for the regeneration of men: so that, sanctification being engendered, a heavenly offspring, reborn as a new creation, may come forth from the immaculate womb of this divine font. And may they all, though differing in age and sex, be alike brought forth as infants by grace, their spiritual mother."

(ii) Next follows an exorcism in which the priest petitions God to command the unclean spirits to depart from these waters. "May this holy and innocent creature be free from every assault of the enemy and purified by the removal of all malice. May it be a living fountain, a

regenerating water, a purifying stream; that whosoever shall be washed in this laver of salvation may, by the working of the Holy Spirit in them, obtain the grace of perfect purification."

(iii) A second consecration and blessing of the water is introduced with these words: "I bless thee, creature of water, by the living God, by the true God, by the holy God." The history of God's mysterious alliance with water is then outlined in a rapid survey, which starts with the creation of the world and ends with the commission of Christ to his apostles. At the beginning of the world the Spirit of God moved over the waters, separating them from the dry land. The fountain of paradise, at God's command, discharged four streams which watered the entire earth. The bitter waters of Mara were changed into a sweet draught, saving the Israelites from death in their journey across the desert. During the time of Moses God again preserved the Hebrew people by the waters which sprang from the rock. Then, came the Christ, the Son of the living God, associating water with his own miracles—the miracle of the wine in Cana, and the walking on the waters. This same creature of water was hallowed by the body of Christ in the baptism of John—the figure of our own sacrament. Finally, the sign of signs—water flowed from the side of Christ on the Cross. So far, God had indicated by figures and shadows that water held a special place in his mysterious designs. But after the resurrection the divine plan stands fully revealed. "Go, teach all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." The creature of water becomes a sacrament of the New Law, an instrument of Christ's power, the fountain of life and salvation.

(iv) The next prayer is one of remembrance. Mindful of Christ's command to baptise all nations, the Church prays God to sanctify the waters of Baptism so that they may be effective for purifying souls. "While we observe these precepts, O omnipotent God, do Thou with Thy mercy assist us; do Thou breathe upon us. Do Thou with Thy mouth, bless these simple waters, so that besides their natural power of cleansing, they may also be effectual for purifying the soul."

(v) The paschal candle, the symbol of the risen Christ, is then lowered three times into the water. This ceremony suggests that it is the risen Christ who communicates his power to the sacrament, that Baptism is a participation in the mystery of Christ's resurrection. "May the power of the Holy Ghost descend into the water which fills this font; and may He give fecundity to the whole substance of this water for the effect of regeneration.

When the candle is withdrawn, we are given a last reminder of the

effects which Baptism produces in the soul—a remission of sins, a rebirth, a restoration to the innocence of paradise. “Here may the stains of all sins be blotted out. Here may human nature created to Thy image and reformed to the honour of its first estate, be cleansed from all the defilement of its old condition: that every man coming to this sacrament of regeneration may be born again into the new childhood of true innocence. Through Jesus Christ Thy Son our Lord, who shall come to judge the living and the dead, and the world by fire. Amen.”

(vi) The rite of blessing is concluded as the priest pours the Oil of Catechumens and Chrism into the water. “May this font be sanctified and made fruitful by the Oil of salvation for such as are born anew therein unto life eternal. Amen. May this infusion of the Chrism of our Lord Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Ghost the Paraclete, be made in the name of the Holy Trinity. Amen. May this co-mingling of the Chrism of sanctification, the Oil of unction, and of the water of baptism be likewise made in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.”

The catechumen has received through the liturgy an eloquent instruction on the nature and the effects of Baptism. He now receives the sacrament which incorporates him into Christ and the Church. On the completion of this ceremony, the baptismal water is carried in procession to the font. The chant and the accompanying prayer find their inspiration in Psalm 41: “As the heart pants after the fountain of water, so my soul thirsts after Thee, O God.”

(d) *The Renewal of Baptismal Promises.* The moment has now come in which the entire congregation, by a public act of worship, professes its faith in the risen Saviour. The people renew the promises once made in Baptism; and spiritually there is a renewal of that moment when the regenerating waters first imparted the life of Christ. This ceremony forms a fitting conclusion to the Easter Vigil. The faithful have already witnessed the liturgical pageant of Christ’s resurrection. During the blessing of the baptismal water they have seen the mystery of Christ’s resurrection brought into contact with the human soul. Baptism is a resurrection with Christ, a living with God, a renunciation of this world, a death to sin. We, therefore, the baptised, pledge our fidelity to Christ and renew the pledges made in Baptism.

The celebrant begins the ceremony by incensing the paschal candle—a tribute to the risen Christ. He then summarises for the faithful the meaning of the Vigil rites which they have just witnessed. “On this most sacred night, dearly beloved brethren, our Holy Mother the

Church, recalling the death and burial of our Lord Jesus Christ, and returning Him love for love keeps vigil; and celebrating the glorious resurrection of the same Lord, she rejoices with great gladness of heart. Now, since, according to the teaching of the Apostle, we have, through baptism, been buried with Christ unto death, so, just as Christ rose from the dead we must also walk in newness of life; knowing that our old self has been crucified together with Christ, that we may serve sin no longer. Let us, therefore, reckon ourselves as dead indeed to sin but living for God in Christ Jesus our Lord. Wherefore, dearly beloved brethren, now that our lenten discipline is finished, let us renew the promises of our holy baptism, whereby we once renounced Satan and his works, together with the world which is at enmity with God, and promised to serve God faithfully in the holy Catholic Church."

The baptismal pledges are then renewed; and the second part of the litanies is chanted. The vigil is now complete. Christ has come to His people.

The solemn mass which follows, is the climax of the liturgy of Easter Eve. The sacrifice of Christ, the true paschal Lamb, is renewed in the mystery of the Eucharist. The sacrifice is offered in memory of this holy night in which Christ rose from the dead. It is offered especially for those who have just been reborn of water and the Holy Ghost. And finally, the union with Christ himself in the sacrament of the Eucharist consummates the union of Baptism.

There is a passage in the Easter sermons of St. Ambrose which recaptures the sentiments of the baptised as they assist at this mass. "Washed by Baptism and adorned with rich garments, they hasten to the altar of God, saying: I will go unto the altar of God, to God who gives joy to my youth. Renewed with the youth of an eagle, they hasten to approach that heavenly banquet."

C. TIERNEY.

Moral Theology

MUTILATION OF THE HUMAN BODY: TRANSPLANTATION OF MEMBERS.

Dear Rev. Sir,

(1) Is it lawful to give portion of one's body to be used for the benefit of another person, v.g. to enable a blind man to see, may a friend donate the cornea of one of his eyes?

(2) Would there be any objection to leaving one's body to the medical school at the University?

Haesitans.

REPLY.

(1) We are convinced that it is a violation of the natural law to consent to the mutilation necessary to obtain the organ required for transplantation in the body of another.

The fifth precept of the decalogue: "Thou shalt not kill," directly forbids the sin of homicide, or the unjust taking of a neighbour's life. By necessary consequence, it also forbids such acts against his person as mutilation, wounding, beating, etc., which, if continued, would lead to homicide. The victim of homicide is deprived of his most precious good; the unfortunate subjected to the lesser acts of violence suffers in the integrity of his members and in their free use and enjoyment—to which he is entitled by the law of nature. Man, his body as well as his soul, is from God. He is the highest of the creatures, for whose benefit all other things were made. Ordinarily, no human authority may deprive him of his life or of what constitutes his human nature as he has it from the Creator. By "ordinarily" we mean to exclude the case of those guilty of capital crimes, who may be condemned and executed by order of the head of the State. "Each individual is compared to the community as a part of its whole; and so if one man is dangerous to the community, and a cause of its corruption because of some crime, it is lawful and praiseworthy to put him to death for the sake of preserving the common good."¹ Likewise, the punishment inflicted for grave crimes, which do not merit the death penalty, may be mutilation, for "just as a person may be deprived of his life by public authority, because of great crimes, so he may be deprived of a member for some lesser offence."² Since the reason for inflicting death or mutilation on evil-doers is the promotion and protection of the common

¹S.T. 2. 2ae. Q. 64. art. 2.

²S.T. 2. 2ae. Q. 65. art. 1.

good, only those charged with the care of the community are competent to impose such dire punishments on malefactors who deserve them. Private persons have no authority to deprive another of his life or members. To do either would be to dispose what is not 'mine' but 'his', and would be a violation of the virtue of commutative justice. For this reason, the fifth commandment is placed at the head of those which bind from justice.

Towards ourselves the virtue of justice does not operate, as justice tends to protect the rights of another. Nothing is more our own than our bodies, but it does not follow that we have a right to dispose of them as we please. Man was made by God to become more perfect and eventually reach his last end. Accordingly, an act of mutilation, which takes away from the perfection of our nature, and a *fortiori*, the act of self-destruction, are contrary to the divine plan, a deviation from the right order, and so morally wrong. This is what is implied when it is asserted that we have over our bodies only a *dominium utile*: we should use our bodies to further the purposes of God in creating us. Our life and members are to be spent and employed in God's service, and to destroy them is to refuse to conform to the will of God. Further, the Almighty is undoubtedly our Master and has a right to our service. To destroy, mutilate or otherwise abuse our bodies is to infringe on the divine rights, and is on our part an act of injustice towards God. Then, there is the precept of charity towards ourselves, which imposes the doing of good and not harm. Although the virtue of justice does not come into force, we are nevertheless forbidden for many reasons to dispose of our bodies and our members as if they were our own property. How far our power over our bodies extends will appear as we proceed.

The intention in the present answer is to discuss briefly the question of self-mutilation, with particular attention to a mutilation which has for its immediate object the transplanting of the member removed to the body of another person. Such a mutilation would require the intervention of a surgeon; but as the surgeon cannot exercise his art unless at the request, or at least with the consent of the patient, the responsibility for the operation rests equally, if not primarily, on the conscience of the subject from whom the organ is removed; it is, therefore, rightly regarded as self-mutilation. We must note that the question is not whether it would be a good thing for the recipient of the transplanted organ to recover his health; but rather, is the removal of the organ from the living body of another a lawful means of achieving this wished-for event. We may not employ evil means even to bring about the best of good effects. In other words, our enquiry is: May

we lawfully mutilate Titius in order to cure Caius? To answer this question, it will be necessary to consider what is mutilation and what of its morality.

To mutilate a person is to cut off an organ of his body, or otherwise destroy it, so that it can no longer exercise its proper function.³ The common notion of mutilation supposes some visible deformity as a result, but external appearance is not always affected by mutilation.⁴ It is sufficient that the organ be rendered useless or notably impeded, even though an observer would notice no abnormality. Some organs of the body are necessary for life itself, and it is evident that to render them ineffective would be homicide or suicide. The amputation of the head, or removal of the heart or both lungs or kidneys, etc., would not be mutilation but total destruction of the man. On the other hand, there are parts of our bodies which are not necessary for our proper functions as rational animals, v.g. the hair of our heads, small portions of the skin, a pint or so of blood. It is not mutilation to dispose of these, as they are in a sense superfluous, and we are none the worse for their loss. Further, nature generally repairs the loss, such as it is, and we quickly regain any accidental perfection that we may have temporarily surrendered. Mutilation leaves us permanently unfit to exercise the functions of an ordinary sound and healthy human being. The organs of sight, hearing, speech, and reproduction, as well as the limbs⁵ are rightly considered parts of the body necessary to lead a normal human life. It is indeed possible to live without them; but the fact that those who lack any of them are the objects of our spontaneous compassion is no slight indication of a natural conviction that they are not easily done without. Our remarks are restricted to the removal or suppression of the functions of the organs or parts of the human body which are of the substantial perfection of our nature.

We are concerned with direct mutilation, intended either as an end in itself or as a means to an end. Malicious injury for its own sake could be inflicted only by the criminal class or the most heartless; but mutilation with a view to some other purpose is also directly voluntary. The amputation of a gangrenous foot to save the life of the patient, sterilisation to avoid conception, injuries inflicted to escape military

³*Mutilatio est quaedam abscissio vel aequivalens actio qua functio organica vel definitus usus membrorum supprimitur aut directe deminuitur. Suppressione habetur perfecta et magis proprie dicta mutilatio. Quare mutilatio est castratio, non autem circumcisio, nec quaedam corporis accommodatio in modum qui ad pulchritudinem conferre vulgo existimatur.* Vermeersch. Theol. Moral. Romae, 1928. Tom.II., n.323.

⁴V.g. sterilisation by means of X. rays.

⁵The loss of a finger or toe is irreparable, but as the consequent inconvenience is generally not considerable, their destruction would likely not amount to grave matter.

service or excite the pity of others, are all examples of direct mutilation. Indirect mutilation follows because of the intervention of another agent or cause in conjunction with our own act. It may be quite blameless, if we could not, or at least, in the circumstances, were not bound to prevent it; or it may be seriously sinful, if reasonable precautions were not taken to avoid harm to ourselves or others, which was foreseen as possible. A familiar example of indirect mutilation is the loss of limb as the result of a motor accident. It may be purely accidental and so free from moral fault, or it may ensue from carelessness of one of the drivers. The gravity of the sin will depend on the deliberate neglect to use the ordinary means of avoiding accidents when life and limb are involved.

Is direct mutilation ever lawful? Briefly, we may answer that it is lawful, on the supreme authority of the State, in punishment of crime; and it is lawful, with the consent of the person affected, if it be necessary for the good of his whole body. Outside these cases it never can be justified.

We have seen, on the authority of St. Thomas, that the State may inflict mutilation as a just punishment for serious crimes that do not deserve the extreme penalty of execution. More common in past ages, this method of punishment is now rarely found among the more cultured peoples. The *lex talionis*, an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth, of the Old Law was an example of mutilation for injuries done to another. Mutilation, if inflicted as a penalty, should be in proportion to the crime, not only in its severity but also in its nature. We may note that sterilisation is not an apt penalty for sexual offences, as it does not extinguish inordinate tendencies. Further, by a decree of the Holy Office, direct sterilisation, temporary or perpetual, whether of man or woman, is condemned as unlawful, without any qualifications.⁶

Can the State permit or order experiments involving mutilation of living persons to be performed in the medical interests of the community? The answer must be decidedly in the negative. Pope Pius XII., in an address delivered on 13th September, 1952, to the First International Congress of Histopathology of the Nervous System recalled that the post-war trials brought to light a frightful quantity of documents testifying to the fact that certain centres demanded a regular supply of men from concentration camps for their medical experiments. "One recoils," remarked the Holy Father, "before such an aberration of the human mind and heart." He asked:

⁶A.A.S. 1940, 73.

"Are the interests of the individual at this point subordinated to common interests of medicine, or do we find here a transgression, albeit it in good faith, of the most basic demands of the natural law, a transgression which cannot be permitted for any reason of medical research? . . .

"Insofar as, in the cases mentioned, the moral justification of the intervention is based on the mandate of public authority, and therefore from the subordination of the individual to the community, of the individual good to the social good, it rests on a mistaken application of this principle. It must be pointed out that man, as a person, in the final reckoning, does not exist for the use of society; on the contrary, the community exists for man."⁷

Continuing, the Holy Father pointed out the difference between the physical unity of the human organism and the moral unity of the community, a unity of finality and of action, which has truly a right to impose demands on the activity of the parts, but in no case can it dispose directly of their physical being.

"Now the medical intervention, of which we are treating here, affects immediately and directly the physical being, either of the whole or of the individual organs of the human organism. But in virtue of the principle we have just stated, in this domain, the public authority has no right: it cannot pass it on, therefore, to investigators and doctors. Furthermore, it is from the State that a doctor must receive the authorisation when he interferes in the organism of the individual in 'the interests of the community.' For then he acts not as a private individual, but as a mandatory of the public power. Even this latter, however, cannot convey to him the right which it does not possess itself . . ."⁸

Public authority, then, has no right directly to mutilate the body of any of its subjects (except in the case of just punishment for crime). Since private individuals have no superiority of their fellows, they have less claim to the power of mutilation than has the State. Even a father has no right over the nature of his son and its members. True it is that he has the right and the obligation to educate his son and if necessary to chastise him, but with the moderation which excludes injury, and is confined to the infliction of transient sense suffering.⁹

What, however, are the rights of the individual regarding the disposal of the organs of his own body? Though we have already seen that he should preserve and perfect what God gave him, it may be asked is it ever lawful for him to mutilate himself or to authorise such a mutilation. Only in one case may he do so: when the good of the whole body requires that portion of it to be sacrificed. Such is the teaching of St. Thomas¹⁰ and the traditional doctrine of the theologians. Each member is a part of the whole body and exists for the sake of

⁷A.A.S. 1952, 786. This address was given in French. The translation here availed of is that published by the Salesian Press, London, for the Pontifical Court Club. "Catholic Documents" X, 12. - 20. In a subsequent Address to the Delegates attending the Sixteenth Session of the International Office of Military Medical Documentation, 19th October, 1953, (A.A.S. 1953, 744-754) and another Address, delivered to those taking part in the VIII Assembly of World Medical Association, 30th September, 1954 (A.A.S. 1954, 587-598), the Holy Father deals with the same matters.

⁸Ibid. p. 787.

⁹S.T. 2.2ae. Q 65. art. 2.

¹⁰Ibid. art. 1.

the whole, just as that which is imperfect exists because of what is perfect. The members of the human body are to be disposed of according to what is useful for the whole body. A member of the human body is *per se* useful for the whole body, but *per accidens*, it can become harmful, as when a diseased member is the cause of detriment to the whole body. Then it is lawful, with the consent of the person who is affected, to cut off the diseased member for the good of the whole body. The reason is that each one is bound to care for his own good health. Likewise, those who have the lawful guardianship of others may consent to their mutilation for the good of the body. Outside this case, and the infliction of just penalties by proper authority, St. Thomas concludes, it is altogether unlawful to mutilate anyone.

This traditional teaching has recently been re-stated by the authority of the Supreme Pontiff in the Address quoted above:

"As far as the patient is concerned, he is not the absolute master of himself, of his body or of his soul. He cannot, therefore, freely dispose of himself as he pleases. Even the motive for which he acts is not the only one for him as a sufficient determining factor in the case. The patient is bound by the immanent purposes fixed by nature. He possesses the right to use, limited by natural finality, the faculties and powers of his human nature. Because he is the beneficiary, and not the proprietor, he does not possess unlimited power to allow acts of destruction, of mutilation, of anatomic or functional character. But in virtue of the principle of totality, of his right to employ the services of the organism as a whole, he can give individual parts to destruction or mutilation when and to the extent that it is necessary for the good of his being as a whole, to assure its existence or to avoid, and naturally to repair grave and lasting damage which could otherwise neither be avoided nor repaired.¹¹

The "principle of totality," as it is called, or the subordination of parts of the human organism to the good of the whole, is applied every day in hospitals and doctors' surgeries. With the consent of the patient, an act of mutilation is performed, and part of the body is cut off to save the whole. It is direct mutilation and perfectly lawful.

Unfortunately, we sometimes hear of mutilations which will not stand the test of the principle of totality. An example is sterilisation of a woman to avoid the dangers—and they may be real dangers—of future pregnancy. The operation may involve no serious risk to life, and the interference with the organs may be, in itself, only slight; but the faculty of reproduction is an important one, and it is a serious loss to be deprived of it, even in the case of those who have embraced the celibate state of life. The suppression of the reproductive organs, which are perfectly healthy and do not threaten the good of the whole body, is not a justifiable interference with a diseased member. It is rather a mutilation with a view to prevent a possible future danger which may arise from another source, is contingent on the free will of man, and should be countered by other and lawful measures, if and when it does

¹¹A.A.S. p. 782.

become actual. Pope Pius XI. wrote in his encyclical on Christian Marriage:

"Christian doctrine establishes, and the light of human reason makes it most clear, that private individuals have no other power over the members of their bodies than that which pertains to their natural functions, except when no other provision can be made for the good of the whole body."¹²

From what has been written it would follow logically that the transplantation of an organ from Titius (his eye, or portion of it, his kidney, glands or any other organ) requires a prior mutilation of Titius, which is not for the good of his whole body. As far as Titius is concerned, the operation whereby he loses an eye is a decided deterioration for he is now bereft of one of his members and is less perfect than when he had two eyes, without any physical compensation. Titius' eye is part of Titius, and was implanted by nature in his body to enable Titius to see: he may use it for that natural function, but has no other dominion over it. Should it be objected that the eye was made to see, and it can fulfil that natural function in Caius' body, and is indifferent to Titius or Caius, we may answer that the natural function of an eye is to see, but the natural function of this eye (Titius') is to see for Titius, for it was implanted by nature in his body and not in that of Caius. If Titius surrenders it, he can no longer see with it; and even though Caius can use the eye to see, it is not part of the person for whom nature intended it. It may be urged that the loss of one eye or one kidney, etc., does not leave a man unable to perform ordinary human functions, and can be justified, therefore, by the reasons advanced for the lawfulness of donating a quantity of blood to one who can be aided by a transfusion. It is true that we can still see with one eye and live with one kidney, etc., but their removal causes a lack and a weakness which can never be repaired. The loss of an eye, for instance, places an additional strain on the other. The possession of both arms and legs will be admitted as necessary for the ordinary duties of life. The dual organs of sight, hearing, and some of the organs of generation, may seem to be a superabundance of nature, but are not really so. They are rather a means to ensure the efficient functioning of the faculty and a provision against the contingencies of life. How many occupations are closed to a person who lacks the sight of one eye or the hearing of one ear? Which is strong indication that common opinion judges him below normal and under a definite handicap, as indeed he is. Is there any one who would consider it a matter of small importance to suffer the loss of one of the duplicated members? The loss of a small quantity of blood, on the other hand, may leave a man

¹²*Casti Connubii*. 31st December, 1930. A.A.S. 1930, 565.

temporarily weak, but in short time nature makes up the defect. Somewhat the same inconveniences follow after a period of hard work.

The argument against the lawfulness of giving one of our members to benefit our neighbour is basically this: The donor acts contrary to the natural law by a direct mutilation, which is not in *bonum totius corporis*. Father Vermeersch¹³ raised the question whether skin-grafting or blood transfusions could be justified on the principle that there is a unity of the human race, and such things, though detrimental to the individual are for the good of a neighbour who is in a sense one with us. As we have seen, there is no need to invoke the principle of the unity of the human race to justify blood transfusion and skin grafting; and, indeed, by this principle they could not be justified. They are simply not mutilations. The principle of totality is not valid if applied to totalities of a different nature. The unity of the human body is physical, while the members of the human family are united only in a moral union.

"The physical organism of living beings, of plants, animals or men, possesses as a whole a unity which subsists of itself. Each of the members, for example, the hand, the foot, the heart, the eye, is an integrant part, destined by its whole being to be one complete organism. Outside the organism it has not of its own nature, any meaning, any purpose: its being is wholly absorbed in the complete organism with which it is linked.

"A quite different state of affairs obtains in the moral community and each organism is of a purely moral character. The whole has not here a unity which subsists in itself, but a simple unity of purpose and of action. In the community, the individuals are only collaborators and instruments for the realisation of the ends of the community."¹⁴

In a physical entity, an integrating part is not of more value than the whole; and it may be sacrificed for the good of the whole. Likewise, in a moral entity, the parts which compose it are subordinated to the whole, in so far as they are one with it, but not in every respect. The human race possesses a moral unity: all its members share the same nature and are destined to reach the same final end, by the use of the same means. They remain, nevertheless, individuals; and their bodily members pertain to them as individuals. The eye with which Titius sees is part of Titius; similarly with Caius. The human race is not made of a union of eyes and ears and arms, and so on. It is a society of men, each of whom possesses these members as part of himself. The external creation may be, and up to a point, should be shared by all; but the individual's own parts cannot be alienated without detriment to his nature, the perfection of which should be his primary concern, and the concern of every community to which he belongs, whether the family, the nation or the common unity of all men. The

¹³I.c.

¹⁴A.A.S. 1952, 786.

principle of totality must be kept within the boundaries of that whole which is under consideration, and cannot be extended beyond them.

"The principle of totality itself affirms nothing except this: where the relationship of whole to part is verified, and in the exact degree to which it is verified, the part is subordinated to the whole, which latter can in its own interest dispose of the part. Too frequently, alas, in resorting to the principle of totality, these considerations are left aside; not only in the domain of theoretical study and the field of application of the law, of sociology, of physics, of biology, of medicine, but also in logic, psychology and metaphysics."¹⁵

It would seem then that no valid argument for mutilation with a view to transplantation can be drawn from the unity of the human race.

Would not the exercise of the virtue of charity justify the giving of one of my members to help a neighbour who is in a worse plight? If it be lawful to risk our lives in an endeavour to save another in distress, a member of the body is of much less value. There is confusion here between direct and indirect killing or mutilation. The extreme need of my neighbour will be reason for risking life or limb, and I may indirectly kill or mutilate myself to save another from death, permitting my own destruction or harm, which is an effect *per accidens*, occurring because of the conjunction of other causes associated with my attempt to succour my neighbour. It is an application of the 'principle of the double effect'.

But I may never lawfully destroy myself as a means of saving the life of a friend. If I could give my heart so that he could live, his recovery and continued life would be through my death. I would not be justified in such a course; neither, for the same reason, may I directly mutilate myself to come to his assistance, no matter how grave. My members as well as my life are not at my free disposal.

A final word with regard to the use of animals for medical experiments. Animals were made for the use and benefit of man. Reason dictates that they be treated with the care due to God's higher creation, but the animals and all their parts and organs are at the disposal of man. Consequently, they may be used as a means of obtaining medical knowledge, and put to the service of mankind in all reasonable ways. Man is the master of creation. He may place his labours and his goods at the disposal of his fellow-men, and in doing so seek to perfect himself; but his person and all that goes to make it up is at the disposal of none save God.

St. Thomas affirms that except in two cases: the infliction of just punishment by competent authority, and for the good of the whole body, direct mutilation is unlawful. That teaching we readily accept.

(2) A corpse is no longer an essential part of a human person, and

¹⁵Ibid. 788.

with due reverence for what was once informed by a spiritual soul, and, in the case of a Christian, the temple of the Holy Ghost, it may be used for medical experiments. Portions of it could be inserted into the body of a living person, if necessary. Of course, the provisions of civil law should be complied with and the wishes of the deceased and his next of kin respected. When a corpse has ceased to serve its purpose to be of benefit to mankind, collectively or individually, it should be given the burial that is its due. With these reservations, it does not seem forbidden to will one's body to a medical school for purposes of the advancement of knowledge.¹⁶

FACULTIES FOR CONFESSIONS OF RELIGIOUS SISTERS

Dear Rev. Sir,

An assistant priest, who has no faculties to hear the confessions of religious sisters, is left in charge of a parish for a short period of time (say a week). Can he validly and lawfully hear the sisters' confessions during that time?

SACERDOS.

REPLY.

A priest who is left in charge of a parish during the temporary absence of the pastor is called a vicar substitute.¹⁷ He enjoys all the faculties of the parish priest in matters pertaining to the care of souls, unless the Bishop of the pastor make any exception.¹⁸ A parish priest and others who take the place of a parish priest have ordinary jurisdiction to hear confessions within the bounds of the parish.¹⁹ Jurisdiction to hear confessions, however, does not include the faculty to hear religious women, for whom special jurisdiction must be given by the Ordinary of the place²⁰; and this applies to all priests whether secular or religious, whatever be their rank or office. Since the parish priest himself requires this special jurisdiction to hear the confessions

¹⁶Cf. the words of Pope Pius XII. to the Members of the VIII Assembly of the World Medical Association: "With regard to the removal of portions of the body of a deceased man for curative purposes, the doctor cannot be allowed to treat the corpse just as he wills. Public authority should intervene to establish suitable regulations. But even the public authority cannot proceed arbitrarily. There are some laws against which one could take serious objections. A rule which leaves it to the doctor in a hospital to remove parts of the body for curative purposes, even though all monetary considerations must be excluded, is inadmissible because of the danger of its being interpreted too broadly. Consideration must also be given to the rights of those with whom rests the care of the body. Finally, the postulates of the natural moral law must be respected, and this prevents us from considering and treating the corpse of a man as if it were an ordinary thing, or as we would treat the body of an animal." A.A.S. 1954, 595.

¹⁷can. 465. 18. can. 474. 19. can. 873, par. 1. 20. can. 876.

of religious women within his parish, there can be no argument that the vicar substitute requires it also. Of course there are the exceptions for a sister who is seriously ill, even though not in danger of death, and for the case of confession made by a sister who requests it *ad tranquillitatem conscientiae*.

JAMES MADDEN.

*

*

*

*

ALL MY LIFE LOVE, a Commentary on St. Therese's poem *Vivre d'Amour*, by Michael Day, Cong. Orat. The Paschal Press, of 36 Drake Road, Harrow, Middlesex. 1953. pp. 56. Price 4/- (Eng.).

For those who do not read French — and even for those who do — Mgr. Ronald Knox's translation provides a close but poetic rendering of the deepest of St. Therese's poems. *Vivre d'Amour* is, in truth, an epitome of her doctrine: that the only way to live a useful and happy life is to run along the way of love. Father Michael Day does not claim too much for it when he declares that "it is a complete treatise on the love of God". Together with Mgr. Vernon Johnson, who writes the foreword, Fr. Day is one of the writers to whom all admirers of St. Therese must be forever grateful for his indefatigable labours in correlating the saint's writers with scriptural doctrine. The use of Mgr. Knox's translation of the Bible adds to the freshness of Father Day's commentary, verse by verse, of *Vivre d'Amour*. (The complete French text of the poem occupies the last four pages of the book.)

Fr. Day's words which close the commentary on the last stanza are worth quoting. The stanza begins:

Of love to die; there lies my hope at last;

The whole stanza leads Fr. Day to his final thought: "There lies our destiny, a life which is all love, seeing with our own eyes the blossoming splendours of eternal beauty . . . To die of love is to be plunged into the vast and tranquil depths of eternal love . . ."

(Our mind goes back to the priest in the novel, *All Glorious Within*, and we take our place with him, wondering at our obtuseness in preferring to stay in a world plastered with cigarette advertisements.)

M.O.

Canon Law

CANON 988 AND IRREGULARITIES FROM CRIME

Canon 988 of the Code of Canon Law reads as follows: "Ignorance of irregularities, whether from crime or from defect, and of impediments does not excuse from them."¹ The purpose of this article is to examine the effect of ignorance on the incurrence of irregularities from crime only,² and to examine this question in the writings of the pre-Code canonists as well as in its expression in the Code itself and the writings of the commentators on the Code.

IGNORANCE AND IRREGULARITIES FROM CRIME BEFORE THE CODE

The canonists before the Code treated the question of the relationship between ignorance and the incurrence of irregularity both in regard to irregularities from defect and from crime. However, they considered that little attention needed to be given under this aspect to the incurrence of irregularities from defect, for it was clear that no species of ignorance, whether vincible or invincible, excused from their incurrence. Granted the existence of the defects expressly stated in the law these irregularities were incurred immediately, provided the subjects of the defects were bound by ecclesiastical laws; and this was true even though those who possessed the defects might be completely ignorant of the law and the irregularity, or even if, while possessing such knowledge, they were unwilling to incur these irregularities. For, as these canonists pointed out, these irregularities from defect were not in any circumstances penalties, not even secondarily and incidentally.³ However, this teaching was not extended to irregularities from crime for ignorance could certainly have an effect on the incurrence of this class of irregularities. Thus, these canonists taught that irregularities from crime were not incurred unless the crime was a grave sin;⁴ and hence they were in

¹ "Ignorantia irregularitatum sive ex delicto sive ex defectu atque impedimentorum ab eisdem non excusat."

²Cfr. can. 985.

³Cfr. Sexten, Hilarius (A), *Tractatus de Censuris Ecclesiasticis cum Appendice de Irregularitate*, Moguntiae, 1898, p.288; Lega, M., *Praelectiones in Textum Juris Canonici, De Delictis et Poenis*, ed. 2, Romae, 1910, n.238.

⁴ Suarez, F., *De Censuris*, disp.XL, sect.III, n.17; St. Alphonsus, *Theologia Moralis*, Tom.IV, ed.Nova (by Leonardus Gaude, C.SS.R.), Lib.VII, cap.V, n.348; Salmanticenses, *Cursus Theologiae Moralis*, Tom.II, Venetiis, 1750, Tr.X, cap.VII, n.12; Schmalzgrueber, F., *Jus Ecclesiasticum Universum*, Tom.V, Pars II, Romae, 1845, Lib.V, Tit.XXXVII, n.76; Boenninghausen, E., *Tractatus Juridico-Canonicus de Irregularitatibus*, Fascic.I., Monasterii, 1863, pp.164,199; Gasparri, P., *Tractatus Canonicus de Sacra Ordinatione*, Vol.I, Parisiis, 1893, nn.191,371; Lega, op.cit.,n.234.

complete agreement in teaching that ignorance which excused from the commission of a mortal sin, indirectly excused also from the incurrance of irregularities from crime.⁵

But there were two matters in connection with ignorance and irregularities from crime which caused disagreement among these canonists. This twofold disagreement was concerned with the fact that a person may know that a certain action is forbidden by the law but may not be aware that an impediment or disqualification has been attached to the performance of the act; or he may also be unaware of the law itself which forbids the action. With this distinction in mind the two matters controverted among these pre-Code canonists may be expressed in the following interrogative forms: (a) Was it necessary for the incurrance of an irregularity from crime that a person should have knowledge of the irregularity itself, or did ignorance of the irregularity itself excuse from incurring it? (b) Was it necessary for the incurrance of an irregularity from crime that a person should always have knowledge of the ecclesiastical law prohibiting the crime, or did ignorance of the ecclesiastical law *always* excuse from incurring the irregularity?

Affirmative and negative answers were given to the first of the two questions proposed above. Those canonists who maintained that knowledge of the irregularities themselves from crime was necessary for their incurrance, and that, therefore, ignorance of these irregularities themselves excused from contracting them, argued that irregularities from crime were punishments imposed for the commission of those crimes to which they were attached by the law, and that, when the penalty for a crime was an extraordinary penalty which could not be foreseen even in a confused manner from the nature of the crime, knowledge of that penalty was necessary before it could be incurred. And, they proceeded to affirm, irregularity from crime was an extraordinary penalty of this kind; consequently, knowledge of it was necessary before it could be contracted.⁶ It was true, they also reasoned, that consent to the penalty on the part of the agent was not necessary in order to incur it, but consent to the act not merely as sinful but also as the cause of the penalty was necessary; and hence it followed that a person who was not aware that

⁵Avila, Stephanus (De), *Tractatus de Censuris Ecclesiasticis*, Ed.Novissima, Lugduni, 1623 Pars. VII, disp.II, dub. 7; Tournely, H., *Praelectiones Theologicae de Universa Theologia Morali*, Tom.II, *Tractatus de Irregularitatibus*, Venetiis, 1746, Pars.I, cap.IV, p.552; Salmanticenses, op.cit., Tr.X, cap.VII, punct.III, n.48; Tamburinus, T., *Theologia Moralis*, Tom.II, Venetiis, 1755, Lib.X, Tr.IV, cap.IV, sect.V, n.I; Schmalzgrueber, op.cit., Lib.V, Tit.XXXVII, n.103.

⁶Cfr. St. Alphonsus, op.cit., Lib.VII, cap.V, n.351, who describes this opinion as "satis probabilis"; Salmanticenses, op.cit., Tr.X, cap.VII, n.53 sq.; Tamburinus, op.cit., Lib.X, Tr.IV, cap.IV, sect.V, n.5; Gasparri, op.cit., n.204; Hilarius A Sexten, op.cit., p.289.

a law bound under pain of incurring such an extraordinary penalty, and who as a consequence could not possibly intend the act as the cause of the penalty, could not be said to incur the penalty.⁷

On the other hand, those who maintained that ignorance of the irregularity itself did not excuse from its incurrence, argued that irregularity from crime was not a medicinal penalty to prevent the commission of future crimes, in which case a warning would be required before its incurrence in order to establish the existence of contumacy; they said that it was a punitive measure on account of a crime by which the delinquent was rendered unfit for the reception and exercise of the sacred ministry. Hence, ignorance did not prevent its incurrence, which resulted simply and automatically from the wilful violation of the law.⁸ Tamburinus added that irregularity from crime was a canonical impediment, and impediments were incurred even if they were not known;⁹ and Tournely expressed a similar argument when he stated that irregularity from crime was founded in the unfitness (*indecentia*) of the act to which it was attached, and that this was not removed simply by ignorance of the irregularity as such; it was independent of any knowledge.¹⁰

Hence, it must be concluded that before the Code a doubt of law existed concerning the question whether ignorance of the irregularity itself arising from crime excused from its incurrence. In practise, therefore, the incurrence of the irregularity could not be urged in such a case.

The second matter controverted among these pre-Code canonists was whether ignorance of the ecclesiastical law prohibiting the crime *always* excused from incurring the irregularity attached to the crime. They agreed that if the crime which gave rise to the irregularity was forbidden only by the ecclesiastical law, e.g., the violation of an ecclesiastical penalty prohibiting the exercise of orders, ignorance of an ecclesiastical law would certainly excuse from the irregularity. The difference of opinion among these authors concerned the case in which the crime which was the cause of the irregularity was forbidden by the divine law as well as by the ecclesiastical law, and a person committed the crime

⁷Cfr. Navarrus, M., *Commentaria et Tractatus*, Tom.II, Venetiis, 1601, cap. XXVII, n.274; St. Alphonsus, op.cit., Lib. VII, cap.V, n.351; Salmanticenses, op.cit., Tr.X, cap.VII, n.52; Schmalzgrueber, op. cit., Lib.V, Tit. XXXVII, n.108; Smith, S., *Elements of Ecclesiastical Law*, Vol.III, *Ecclesiastical Punishments*, ed.3, New York, 1890, n.1944; Hilarius A Sexten, op.cit., pp.288-289.

⁸Cfr. Suarez, op.cit., disp.XL, sect.V, n.9; St. Alphonsus, op.cit., Lib. VII, cap.V, n.351 who called this opinion "valde probabilis"; Tournely, op.cit., Tr.de Irregularitatibus, Pars.I, cap.IV, p.553; Salmanticenses, op.cit., Tr.X, cap.VII, n.54, who described this opinion as "aeque probabilis" and preferred it to the other opinion; Schmalzgrueber, op.cit., Lib.V, Tit.XXXVII, n.107; Smith, op.cit., nn.1707, 1903.

⁹Tamburinus, op.cit., Lib.X, Tr.IV, cap.IV, sect.V, n.9.

¹⁰Tournely, op.cit., Tr. de Irregularitatibus, Pars.I, cap.IV, p.553; cfr. also Gasparri, op.cit., n.204; Wernz, F.X., *Jus Decretalium*, Tom.II, Pars I, ed.3, Prati, 1915, n.101.

knowing that it was a violation of the divine law but in ignorance of the fact that it also violated the additional ecclesiastical law.

Many pre-Code canonists affirmed that ignorance of the ecclesiastical law when it thus coincided with the divine law excused from the incurrance of the irregularity.¹¹ To support their opinion they appealed to arguments from authority and from reason. Thus, they endeavoured to base an argument upon a passage in the first part of the Decree of Gratian which was concerned with a declaration by Pope Innocent I that certain clerics who had been guilty of incontinency were not to be deposed if they were in ignorance that this penalty had been imposed by a Constitution of Pope Siricius;¹² and yet, these canonists pointed out, the offence of these clerics was also a violation of the natural law.¹³ A passage from the *Liber Sextus* of Boniface VIII was also appealed to in confirmation of their opinion.¹⁴

These canonists also adduced arguments from reason. Thus, making the distinction between the divine law and the ecclesiastical law prohibiting the same offence, they argued that the ecclesiastical law as established by the legislator constituted a new law, and consequently a person who was in ignorance of this new law and who committed the offence in question, sinned against the divine law which he knew but not against the ecclesiastical law; for he could not be said to have sinned against a law of the existence of which he was not aware. Consequently, he should incur only the penalty attached to the divine law, and not the penalty attached to the ecclesiastical law.¹⁵ A variation of this line of reasoning was that they argued that irregularity was incurred only by force of the ecclesiastical law; and since this law affected only its transgressors and a person was not formally its transgressor unless he knew its existence, it followed that a person ignorant of it should not incur the

¹¹Cfr. St. Alphonsus, *op.cit.*, Lib.VII, cap.V, n.350; Schmalzgrueber, *op. cit.*, Lib.V, Tit.XXXVII, n.105, although he conceded probability to the other opinion; Hilarius A Sexten, *op.cit.*, p.289; Laurentius J., *Institutiones Iuris Ecclesiastici*, ed.3., Friburgi-Brisgoviae, 1914, n.74; Suarez, *op.cit.*, disp.XL, sect.V, n.10, who, although he finally adopted the opposing opinion, described this opinion as having probability.

¹²C.2, D. LXXXII.

¹³Cfr. St. Alphonsus, *op.cit.*, Lib.VII, cap.V, n.350; Salmanticenses, *op.cit.*, Tr.X, cap.VII, n.49; Schmalzgrueber, *op.cit.*, Lib.V, Tit.XXXVII, n.105.

¹⁴C.2, l.2, in Sext: "Ligari nolumus ignorantes; dum tamen eorum ignorantia crassa non fuerit aut supina". Cfr. also Salmanticenses, *op.cit.*, Tr.X, cap.VII, n.49; Schmalzgrueber, *op.cit.*, Lib.V, Tit.XXXVII, n. 105; Smith, *op.cit.*, n.1711.

¹⁵St. Alphonsus, *op.cit.*, Lib.VII, cap.V, n.350; Salmanticenses, *op.cit.*, Tr.X, cap.VII, n.49, who added that otherwise proper proportion between the penalty and the crime would not be observed; Viva, D., *Cursus Theologico-Moralis*, Tom.IV, Pars VIII, De Censuris, Ferrariae, 1757, qu. VIII, art.II, n.4; Hilarius A Sexten, *op.cit.*, p.289.

penalty attached to its violation since in that case he would not formally violate it.¹⁶

Other authors, however, opposed this view and maintained that the irregularity was incurred if a person, ignorant of the ecclesiastical law forbidding the crime, knowingly committed the crime in violation of the divine law.¹⁷ This opinion maintained that, when an offence to which irregularity was attached was committed against the divine law, ignorance only of the ecclesiastical law prohibiting the same offence did not excuse from the irregularity because the Church could attach irregularity to the act itself, so that the performance of the act only as an offence against the divine law would induce the irregularity even though there was no formal violation of the ecclesiastical law. And, it was claimed, in the absence of any explanation or assertion to the contrary the legislator was to be presumed to have acted in this manner.¹⁸ It was also urged that this reasoning was confirmed by the very nature of irregularity which consisted in an unfitness for promotion to or exercise of orders, for in the matter under consideration the act to which irregularity was attached possessed this unfitness in as much as it was opposed to the divine law and antecedently to the ecclesiastical prohibition. Hence, if a person knew of this malice of the act he would sin against the divine law and would incur the irregularity attached to the performance of such an unfitting act.¹⁹

It can be seen, therefore, that before the Code there existed a doubt of law as to whether knowledge of the ecclesiastical law was necessary for the incurrance of irregularity from crime when this law coincided with the divine law.²⁰ Consequently, the incurrance of the irregularity could not be urged in a case in which there was ignorance of the ecclesiastical law.

IGNORANCE AND IRREGULARITIES FROM CRIME AFTER THE CODE

The first observation to be made in the light of the Code legislation concerning ignorance and irregularities from crime is that ignorance

¹⁶Cfr. Salmanticenses, op.cit., Tr.X, cap.VII, n.49; Hilarius A. Sexten, op.cit., p.289; Suarez, op.cit., disp.XL, sect.V, n.9, who, although teaching the other opinion, gave this argument as indicating the probability of this opinion.

¹⁷Suarez, op.cit., disp.XL, sect.V, n.10; Gasparri, op.cit., n.205; Lega, op.cit., n.238.

¹⁸Cfr. Suarez, op.cit., disp.XL, sect.V, n.10; Tournely, op.cit., Tr. de Irregularitatibus, Pars I, cap.IV, p.554.

¹⁹Suarez, op.cit., disp.XL, sect.V, n.10; Tournely, op.cit., Tr. de Irregularitatibus, Pars I, cap.IV, pp.553-554; Tamburinus, op. cit., Lib.X, Tr. IV, sect.V, n.3, who regarded both opinions as possessing probability; Theologia Mechlinensis, Tractatus de Censuris, Casibus Reservatis, Irregularitatibus et Libris Prohibitis, ed.2, Mechliniae, 1898, n.2, qu.4.

²⁰Lega, op.cit., n.238.

which excuses from the commission of a mortal sin excuses indirectly from the incurrance of irregularities arising from crime. This is a clear conclusion from canon 986 which requires a grave sin as a necessary condition for incurring irregularities from crime;²¹ and this teaching, which was affirmed by the pre-Code canonists, is also confirmed and emphasized by the commentators on the Code.²²

An examination must now be made in the light of the Code legislation of those two problems which occupied the attention of the pre-Code canonists to a considerable degree, without ever attaining a definite conclusion. They are: (a) Does ignorance of the irregularity itself excuse from incurring it? (b) Does ignorance of the ecclesiastical law prohibiting the crime excuse from the incurrance of the irregularity when this law coincides with the divine law of which there is knowledge?

Since the promulgation of the Code there can no longer be any room for controversy as to whether knowledge of the irregularity from crime itself is necessary for its incurrance. The legislator states clearly: "Ignorance of irregularities, whether from crime or from defect, and of impediments does not excuse from them".²³ Therefore, knowledge of the irregularity itself from crime is not necessary for its incurrance. It follows that the opinion which, before the Code began to bind, maintained that such knowledge was necessary, now loses all probability as a result of this legislation and may no longer be defended.

The reason for this declaration of the legislator is founded in the very nature of irregularities, and thus this declaration is "a logical application of the principle that irregularities are not properly-called penalties".²⁴ The reason for the institution of irregularities is founded primarily in the desire of the Church to maintain and safeguard the dignity of and reverence for the clerical state, and not in the desire to impose a penalty, whether medicinal or punitive.²⁵ Hence in promulgating the laws which impose irregularities the Church is really making certain definite declarations concerning the qualities she requires in her ministers. This is true also of irregularities from crime. Since, therefore,

²¹"Haec delicta irregularitatem non pariunt, nisi fuerint gravia peccata, post baptismum perpetrata, salvo praescripto can. 985, n.2, itemque externa, sive publica sive occulta".

²²Cfr. Hickey, J., *Irregularities and Simple Impediments in the New Code of Canon Law*, Washington, 1920, p.85; Blat, A., *Commentarium Textus Codicis Iuris Canonici*, Lib.III, Pars I, De Sacramentis, ed.2, Romae, 1924, n.563; Wernz, F.X.-Vidal, P., *Ius Canonicum*, Tom.IV, De Rebus, Vol.I, Romae, 1934, n.232; Cappello, F., *Tractatus Canonico-Moralis de Sacramentis*, Vol. IV, De Sacra Ordinatione, Taurini et Romae, 1951, n.455; Coronata, M. (A.), *Institutiones Iuris Canonici*, *Tractatus Canonicus de Sacramentis*, Vol.II, De Ordine, ed.2, Taurini, 1948, n.147.

²³Canon 988.

²⁴Augustine, C., *A Commentary on the New Code of Canon Law*, Vol.IV, ed.3, St. Louis, 1925, p.502.

²⁵Cfr. I Tim., III, 2 sq., V. 22; Tit. I, 6; also Suarez, op. cit., disp. XL, sect.IV, nn. 2,3,5.

all irregularities aim directly at the preservation of the dignity of the clerical state, it follows that immediately the defect or crime certainly exists the dignity of the clerical state is imperilled, and it is immaterial whether the subject of the defect or crime knows this or not; independently of his knowledge or ignorance the necessary quality is lacking. Thus Woywod remarks: "The Church makes freedom from the irregularities and impediments part of the necessary qualifications for ordination, and whenever a man lacks any of these (either through his own fault, by mere accident, or through the malice of others), he cannot be ordained".²⁶

With regard to the second problem stated above the commentators on the Code, like their predecessors before the Code, are in complete agreement in affirming that if an irregularity arises from the violation of a law which is merely ecclesiastical, ignorance of the ecclesiastical law excuses from the incurrence of the irregularity because in such a case the external violation cannot be considered as a grave offence.²⁷

However, as has been shown in the first part of this article, the real difficulty to which the pre-Code canonists devoted their attention

²⁶Woywod, S., *A Practical Commentary on the Code of Canon Law*, 2 Vols., Revised Ed., New York, 1948, Vol.1, n.951. However we cannot agree with the canonical argument advanced by Hickey to show that ignorance of irregularities does not excuse from them. Using canon 16 as the foundation of his argument he writes: "The law concerning irregularity and simple impediments is an inhabilitating one, and no ignorance of invalidating or inhabilitating laws excuses unless the law explicitly admits ignorance as an excuse. Consequently a person who is ignorant of the existence of the law, is not excused from contracting an irregularity"; *op.cit.*, pp.84-85. This line of reasoning was also adopted by other canonists; *cfr.* Claeys-Bouuaert, F., *Simenon, G., Manuale Juris Ecclesiastici*, Tom.II, De Sacramentis, Gandae et Leodii, 1951, n.206; De Meester, A., *Iuris Canonici et Iuris Canonico-Civilis Compendium*, Tom.III, Pars II, Appendix de Irregularitatibus aliisque Impedimentis ad Ordines, Brugis, 1938, n.1922.

An inhabilitating law is a law which on account of some special reason renders a person unqualified to act validly; e.g., canon 1067; and the Code states that only those laws are to be considered as invalidating or inhabilitating which expressly or equivalently state that an action is null and void or that a person is incapacitated from acting validly; *cfr.* canon II. But the laws which impose irregularity neither expressly or equivalently state that those who are irregular cannot validly receive orders or exercise orders already received. Rather the Code clearly asserts that irregularities are concerned only with liceity; *cfr.* canon 968. Hence the reception and exercise of orders by those who are irregular become unlawful but not invalid. In other words, irregularities are prohibiting or impeding impediments, and not diriment or invalidating impediments. Consequently, since the laws which impose irregularity are not inhabilitating laws in the sense of canon 16, this canon cannot be used to justify the ruling of canon 988; and, in any case, it is not necessary. It is significant, too, that this argument is not used by the later authors. Vermeersch-Creusen adverts to this line of reasoning, but avoids the error of the other authors already quoted by using the argument only in an analogous way: "Ex analogia idem de his impedimentis statuitur"; *cfr.* Vermeersch, A.-Creusen, J., *Epitome Iuris Canonici*, Tom.II, ed.6, Mechliniae et Romae, 1940, n.254.

²⁷*Cfr.* Vermeersch-Creusen, *op.cit.*, n.255; Jorio, T., *Theologia Moralis*, Vol. III, ed.6, Neapoli (Italia), 1940, n.949; Cappello, *op.cit.*, n.455; Coronata, *op.cit.*, n.159. In accordance with the principle already laid down, the supposition is that the ignorance is such as to excuse from a grave sin.

is that which arises when the ecclesiastical law coincides with the divine law in prohibiting an act, to the performance of which the Church adds the incurrance of irregularity, e.g., homicide. Does ignorance of the ecclesiastical law prohibiting the crime excuse from incurring the irregularity in such a case, when the person has knowledge of the prohibition of the divine law?

The Code of Canon Law itself does not help towards a solution of this question since in canon 988 the legislator restricts his ruling to ignorance of the irregularities themselves, and he does not explicitly extend it to ignorance of the ecclesiastical laws which forbid the crimes from which the irregularities arise. Nor is any reference to this question contained in any other canon. Thus, especially in the absence of any positive ruling in this matter, it is not surprising to find after the promulgation of the Code a continuation of the pre-Code uncertainty.²⁸

However, for the reasons which follow, we here state our preference for the opinion which maintains that knowledge of the ecclesiastical law is not required for the incurrance of the irregularity in the case that is being contemplated; and that, therefore, ignorance of the ecclesiastical law forbidding the crime does not excuse from contracting the irregularity when the ecclesiastical law coincides with the divine law and there is knowledge of the divine law:

(a) Irregularity from crime is not primarily a penalty but an impediment to the reception and exercise of orders, which arises from the special indignity induced by the commission of certain crimes. Now those acts which cause this indignity and which are also forbidden by the divine law are already capable of giving rise to this unfitness independently of any additional ecclesiastical law forbidding the act. Hence, if the legislator attaches irregularity to such criminal acts the irregularity is also incurred by the performance of those acts as opposed to the divine law, even though a formal transgression of the ecclesiastical law does not occur.

(b) In this matter the legislator does not make any distinction between the divine law and the ecclesiastical law in those cases in which the ecclesiastical law repeats the prohibition of the divine law. He simply gives the ruling that those who are guilty of the offences enumerated incur irregularity. Now a person who performs these acts, knowing only that they are forbidden by the divine law, commits the crime and incurs the indignity to which the Church has attached irregularity; and there-

²⁸Cfr. Capello, *op.cit.*, n.455; Coronata, *op.cit.*, n.159. These two authors seem to incline to the opinion that knowledge of the divine law suffices for the incurrance of the irregularity. On the other hand, however, Jorio definitely and explicitly rejects this opinion and adopts the opposing view; cfr. Jorio, *op.cit.*, n.949.

fore he incurs the irregularity itself. If the legislator does not make any distinction between the divine and ecclesiastical laws in the case, a distinction made by others would appear to be somewhat arbitrary. This reason seems to assume greater force when it is remembered that ignorance of the irregularity itself does not excuse, since this makes it unnecessary for the legislator to make such a distinction and to declare that the irregularity is incurred even by the violation of the divine law alone.

(c) In Canon 986 the legislator sets down the general conditions which are necessary for the incurrance of any irregularity from crime; and a formal violation of the divine law alone can be a grave sin, committed after baptism, external, public or occult, thus fulfilling the conditions required by this canon. According to Jorio, who may have anticipated such an argument, it is not sufficient for the incurrance of the irregularity that a person should sin gravely and externally against the divine law, but it is necessary that he should sin against and with the knowledge of the ecclesiastical law which prohibits the act as a crime (*delictum*) according to the definition of canon 2195,1.²⁹ However, the only foundation for this assertion seems to be the use of the term *delictum* (*irregularitates ex delicto*) by the legislator, and since this term as used in these canons concerning irregularities has not the strict meaning of canon 2195,1 but rather has a wider sense, the assertion of Jorio appears to lose its force.³⁰

(d) The arguments adduced to support the opposing opinion seem to an extent to suppose that which should be proved. The method of argument appears to suppose that irregularity is attached only to the ecclesiastical law which prohibits the offence, from which the holders of

²⁹Jorio, *op.cit.*, n.949.

³⁰In canon 2195,1 the legislator gives a precise definition of the term *delictum*; and hence it is to be expected that the term will have this exact meaning wherever it occurs in the Code. However, there is good reason for maintaining that, when the legislator applies this term to the offences stated in canon 985 as the causes of the irregularities, he is not adhering to this strict signification but is using this term in a wider sense. In canon 2195,1 *delictum* is defined as an external and morally imputable violation of a law to which is attached a canonical sanction which is at least indeterminate. If, therefore, the term *delictum* as applied to these irregularities is used in its strict sense, it should follow that in each of the offences mentioned in canon 985 the elements of this definition should be present. In fact, however, this is not so for a canonical sanction is not applied in the Code to all of these offences. Consequently, the term cannot here be used in its strict meaning. It cannot be said that the irregularity itself is the canonical sanction. Canonical penalties have as their purposes the correction of the delinquent and the punishment of the crime; cfr. canon 2215. But the purpose of irregularity is the maintenance and preservation of the dignity of the clerical state. It has already been pointed out in this article that irregularities are not strictly penalties. Cfr. also Hickey, *op.cit.*, p.71, who adopts this interpretation but unfortunately does not give the reasons for his assertion that "crime as here used in the Code however simply denotes a serious offence"; Blat, *op.cit.*, n.344, who states that the term *delictum* may here be aptly used although the strict definition of *delictum* is not verified; Regatillo, E., *Ius Sacramentarium*, ed.2, Santander, 1949, n.952, who notes that not all the offences enumerated in canon 985 have a canonical penalty attached to them.

this opinion conclude that it can be incurred only by the formal violation of that ecclesiastical law. But that supposition should be proved and does not appear to be proved.³¹ A distinction surely exists between the ecclesiastical law which forbids an offence and the ecclesiastical law which attaches irregularity to that offence. In the Code the laws of canon 985 are the only laws which set down the irregularities attached to the various offences, but these laws themselves are not the ecclesiastical laws which forbid those offences to which the irregularities are attached. Therefore, it cannot be argued from canon 985 that, where the divine and ecclesiastical laws coincide, the irregularity is attached only to the formal violation of the ecclesiastical law which forbids the offence. Since this is so it appears to be a reasonable conclusion that, in the absence of any restrictive disposition on the part of the legislator, there does not seem to be sufficient justification for asserting that the irregularity has regard only to the ecclesiastical law prohibiting the crime and that it operates only through the violation of this law. This would appear to be begging the question. Irregularity itself is of ecclesiastical institution, but from that fact alone it does not necessarily follow that it operates only through the formal violation of ecclesiastical laws.

G. C. GALLAN.

³¹The general line of reasoning which appears to underlie this opinion is as follows: The person who does not know the ecclesiastical law which forbids an act to which irregularity is attached, may sin against the divine law but not against the ecclesiastical law; consequently, he does not merit to incur the irregularity attached to the violation of the law. This reasoning, however, clearly supposes that the irregularity as such is attached only to the ecclesiastical law prohibiting the crime; which is the very point that should be proved.

Liturgy

PRAYERS AFTER MASS

Dear Rev. Sir,

May a priest (a) at the conclusion of the reading of the list of the recently deceased and anniversaries in the Notice Book say some prayers (Our Father, Hail Mary, Eternal rest, etc.) for the repose of their souls?

(b) make (and say the words of) the sign of the Cross at the conclusion of the prayers after Mass.

Many priests do both (a) and (b), but others condemn the practice as being strictly incorrect.

SACERDOS

REPLY

1. There does not seem to be any reason that would exclude the practice of saying some of the prayers mentioned for the repose of the souls of the deceased persons whose names have been announced. Unless prescribed by some local law, the prayers would not be obligatory.

2. The Sign of the Cross (with or without saying the words) does not form part of the prayers prescribed after a Low Mass, consequently it should not be added.

Readers of the A.C.R. may be interested to learn of a recent Rescript granted by the Sacred Congregation of Rites to the Archbishop of Bologna, Cardinal Lecaro, touching on the matter of the prayers after Mass. The Cardinal had asked that, in view of the need for the maximum amount of religious instruction and of the desire to avoid prolonging the time required for the celebration of Mass, it might be permitted to omit the prayers prescribed after a Low Mass, when a homily has been preached during the Mass. The Congregation granted the request as a special favour (*de speciali gratia*). The writer of the commentary on the above Rescript in the *Ephemerides liturgicae* (lxx (1956), pp. 41-43) describes it as another example of the maternal discretion that the Church has already shown in the general Decree simplifying the rubrics. Some may regret the omission of these prayers for the conversion of sinners, for the liberty of the Church, but the decision of the Congregation acknowledges the greater urgency of the need for instruction in the faith. The faithful may well be exhorted to pray for the same intentions by employing the prayers of the Canon of the Mass in which we ask our heavenly Father to grant to the Church peace, to protect, unite and govern her.

The present concession has been granted only to the Archdiocese of Bologna and may not be used elsewhere, but the same writer expresses the hope that it may be accepted as indicative of the mind of the Church and may be extended soon to all dioceses.

* * * *

VOTIVE MASS ON FIRST FRIDAY

Dear Rev. Sir,

On the first Friday of each month we have in our church Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament, beginning after the morning Mass and concluding with Benediction immediately before the evening Mass. Is it permissible, in the circumstances to say the votive Mass of the Sacred Heart both in the morning and in the evening, and if not, which of the two Masses may be the votive Mass?

PASTOR

REPLY

A decision of the Congregation of Rites (31st March, 1954) bears directly on the question. The Archbishop of Paris asked the Congregation: (1) whether the votive Mass of the Sacred Heart could be celebrated in churches and oratories, with the permission of the Local Ordinary, on the evening of the first Friday of each month, when the special devotions in honour of the Sacred Heart were held in the evening to allow the faithful to attend; (2) whether, in churches and oratories in which the votive Mass is celebrated in the morning, it may be celebrated again in the evening with the same privileges if the special devotions are repeated in the evening? The Congregation gave an affirmative reply to both questions (cfr. *Ephem. liturg.* lxviii (1954), p. 259).

Consequently, when the Bishop grants permission for an evening Mass on the first Friday of the month, this Mass may be the privileged votive Mass of the Sacred Heart provided that it is preceded or followed by the special devotions in honour of the Sacred Heart. This remains true even though the devotions and Mass have already taken place in the morning in the same church. In the circumstances described by our correspondent, the Exposition during the afternoon and the Benediction preceding the Mass would seem to fulfill all the requirements for the privileged votive Mass. Some doubt might arise in regard to the sufficiency of the devotions in the morning. The original decree granting the privilege to celebrate the votive Mass made no specific rules for the nature of the special devotions, hence it belongs to the Local Ordinary to determine what is required and his permission is likewise required for the use of the privilege.

SERMONS BEFORE BLESSED SACRAMENT— REVERENCES TO ALTAR

Dear Rev. Sir,

i. What is the ruling for a veil or cover before the Blessed Sacrament exposed when preaching?

ii. Must one genuflect when passing the centre of the altar when (a) the Blessed Sacrament is present, (b) when It is not present? I notice that some just bow the head, is this correct?

INTERESTED

REPLY

The Blessed Sacrament is exposed in the monstrance for the veneration of the people; they come to adore our divine Saviour present in the Blessed Eucharist. In the light of this principle, anything that withdraws the attention of the worshippers from the Blessed Sacrament must be considered out of place during Exposition. A sermon, even on the Blessed Eucharist, must necessarily withdraw the attention of the congregation from the Blessed Sacrament, at least temporarily. Consequently, the Roman practice excludes sermons during the Forty Hours' Prayer, but a decision of the Congregation of Rites would allow a sermon in the presence of the Blessed Sacrament exposed, provided that a veil be placed before the Blessed Sacrament during the sermon (D. 3728, 2). The reply quoted makes no distinction about the subject matter of the sermon, and the rule would seem to hold good even when the sermon is preached on the Eucharist Itself. This veil may be placed over the monstrance, or, more conveniently perhaps, a small silken banner may be placed in front of the monstrance.

A practical application of this rule would occur during the devotion of the Holy Hour as commonly observed in parochial churches. Keeping in mind the above principle, the priest conducting the Holy Hour should prepare his words in the form of a meditation, directing them to the Blessed Sacrament, and focusing the thoughts of the congregation on the Blessed Sacrament, not on the content of his own words. In this way, the priest leads the congregation in adoration and prayer. There would be no need to place a veil before the Blessed Sacrament in this instance.

2. Outside of Mass, the correct reverence to make to the Blessed Sacrament present in the tabernacle on the altar is a simple genuflection when passing before it. If the Blessed Sacrament is exposed on the altar, a genuflection on both knees is required, except in the case in which one has some duties to perform at the altar, e.g., arranging flowers, candles, when it suffices to genuflect on both knees on arriving at and

leaving the altar of Exposition, and on one knee in passing before the centre of the altar to carry out the special duties.

When the Blessed Sacrament is not present on the altar, a moderate bow, i.e., bowing the body from the waist to some extent but not so low as in the profound bow, is made to the altar and the Cross.

* * * *

SOME DECREES OF THE CONGREGATION OF RITES

TWO IMAGES OF THE SAME MYSTERY

The Congregation of Rites decreed that it was not permissible to erect a picture of our Lady of the Rosary of Pompei in a chapel of a church in which there was already an altar and image of Our Lady of the Rosary in another chapel of the same church (*Ephem. liturg.* lxviii (1954), p. 370).

GENUFLECTION BEFORE AND AFTER RECEIVING COMMUNION

In view of varying practices in the matter, the Congregation was asked whether those receiving Holy Communion should genuflect both in coming to Communion and in returning, and whether they should genuflect on one or two knees? The reply stated that they should genuflect both before and after receiving Communion and on one knee only. One comment on the decision notes that the practice indicated by the Sacred Congregation is common in Italy, France and Spain, whereas in England (and we might add Australia) and Germany it has been the general custom to omit the genuflection after receiving Communion (cfr. *ibid.* pp. 370-371).

CELEBRANT STANDS FOR HYMNS DURING BENEDICTION

A reply of the Congregation of Rites (27th November, 1946) directs the priest (and ministers) to stand during the *Te Deum*, Canticles (e.g. Magnificat, Benedictus) and hymns when these are sung in the presence of the Blessed Sacrament exposed (*ibid.* p. 371).

COLOUR OF TABERNACLE VEIL IN LENT AND ADVENT

The following question was proposed to the Congregation: Whether it is lawful during Advent and Lent to use a violet tabernacle veil even on feast days of Saints of greater and lesser double or semi-double rite, in order to impress the spirit of penance on the faithful; the white and red veils would be used only on feasts of the first and second class. The reply stated that the colour of the tabernacle veil should be either white or the colour corresponding to the Office of the day (*ibid.* pp. 372-373).

THE APOSTOLATE AND THE SACRAMENTS

The traditional teaching of the Church has always regarded the work of the apostolate and the action of the sacraments as contemporaneous elements, not successive stages, of the action of God and the Church in the conversion of men. Abbe A. Chavasse, whose thought is resumed here, has drawn attention to these two elements, as found in the Mass and in the cycles of the liturgical year (cfr. *Les questions liturgiques et paroissiales*, 1955, pp. 111-118).

No one can question the dual character of the structure of the Mass, which is at once a Service of the Word of God and a Eucharistic Service. To understand why the first part of the Mass is made up of readings from the Bible, of chants from the same source and of a homily or sermon, and why the second part consists essentially in the Eucharistic Sacrifice and Communion, one must recall the relation between the Word of God and the Action of the Sacraments in the work of salvation. Man receives from God a twofold gift, the exterior gift of the Word of God, and the interior gift of the virtues of faith, hope and charity. Exteriorly, the Word of God instructs and guides man; interiorly, the light of faith and the force of charity give him the power to correspond with this teaching and with these directives. In the person of Christ the Christian has an authentic Model of the Father Whom he must imitate. But Christ is more than a model, He is also the Master of our souls, Who efficaciously inspires them with His graces.

This double aspect of the action of our Divine Saviour is exemplified in the two parts of the Mass. In the first part of the Mass, the Word of God is proclaimed to men by the ministry of the Church in the form of the readings from the Scriptures and in the homily. The Word of God committed by Christ to the Church must be accommodated to the situations of everyday life; this task is carried out in an authentic fashion by the minister of Christ in the homily. In the voice of the lector and of the preacher we hear the voice of Christ Himself. But the reading of the Word of God is not of itself sufficient to convert the heart of man, who yet needs interior assistance to enable him to conform to the message he has heard. The Eucharistic Sacrifice is the efficacious source of this conformity. Invited by the first part of the Mass to conform ourselves to Christ, we receive Christ in the Eucharist as the interior principle of this conformity. In the light of these truths we may understand why all the liturgies of the Church combine the instructional and sacramental actions in the liturgical gatherings of the faithful. The Word of God and the Sacraments are the two columns supporting all apostolic action; they are as inseparable as the two

functions of Christ as the Spokesman for God and the Converter of men's hearts.

The liturgical cycle merits attention because it has a profound influence on the Mass. Each year the course of salvation is unfolded in the temporal and sanctoral cycles of the liturgical year. The liturgical cycle is fundamentally biblical and eucharistic. The first part of the Mass, the Scriptural readings, always retains its essential function, although the contents of this part may vary from season to season. In every season and on every feast the Word of God is proclaimed in an authentic manner. In similar fashion, we always find in the second part of the Mass, the same Eucharistic celebration; the sacrificial and sacramental function remains the same.

The temporal cycle is entirely centred on the person of Christ, and has its variety from the detailed and successive celebration of the different mysteries of Christ. A question naturally presents itself at this stage: Why do we celebrate successively the mysteries of Christ since He now reigns in the unity of His being at the right hand of the Father, and He sums up in one indivisible act the whole mystery of salvation? The glorious Christ is above history, but in order to continue His function of Spokesman for God and Converter of hearts amongst men who live in space and time, He must still insert Himself in space and time, indirectly through the medium of His Church. When the Church proposes to bring to us the salvific act of Christ, she can present it only under the historical forms in which it was first constituted on this earth, from the birth of Christ to His Death and Ascension. All the Scriptures constantly lead us back to the life of Christ on this earth. The liturgical celebration of the mysteries of the life of Christ is a memorial of those past events, but it is something more because it is of the sacramental order. What is recalled in the Scriptural readings is dispensed in the Eucharistic celebration. The union of these two elements constitutes the essential value of the liturgical cycle. The Scriptural recollection of each mystery of the life of Christ finds the actual reality of its content in the Eucharistic celebration, and the Eucharistic celebration gives to us the presence of Christ and His sanctifying action according to the implications of the Scriptural recollection.

Christ is likewise the centre of the Sanctoral cycle, but He is presented to us in a different manner. In place of knowing Christ in the various stages of His historical life, we learn of Him in His Saints, the members of His Mystical Body. The Scriptural readings are there to recall the Saint's conformity to Christ, and the canonisation of the Saint assures us of the authentic reproduction of the virtues of Christ in the life of the Saint. The Eucharist unites us to the Mystical Body

according to the implications of the ideal of sanctity that shines forth in the life of the Saint set before us by the Church for our veneration. The annual liturgical cycle really renews for us the cycle of salvation and assimilates us, little by little, to our Saviour and Master, Jesus Christ.

* * * *

AUSTRALIAN LITURGICAL WEEK

It was a happy thought of the Melbourne Diocesan Commission for the Liturgy and Sacred Music to publish the proceedings of the First Australian Liturgical Week held in Melbourne, January, 1955.¹

The encyclical letters of the present Holy Father on the Mystical Body and the Sacred Liturgy have given us a clearer understanding of the teaching of His predecessor, St. Pius X, who declared the Sacred Liturgy to be the indispensable source of the Christian life. Apostolic labours will be of no avail unless they are accompanied by the outpourings of divine grace, which in turn is dispensed to men through the liturgy of the Church. No great process of logic is required to appreciate that in the measure in which men learn more of the true value and importance of the liturgy in their lives, so they shall be drawn the closer to the source of grace. The Restored Order of Holy Week is a practical example of the essential character of the liturgy in the life of the Church. One might reasonably conjecture that not a few clerical eyebrows would have been raised a year ago had someone stated that it would be far more beneficial for the faithful to attend the liturgical rites of Good Friday morning than the Stations of the Cross on the afternoon of the same day, yet, in fact, that is precisely what the Sacred Congregation has said in its Instruction on the Restored Order, and that is why we shall henceforth celebrate the Liturgical Action in the afternoon.

The papers read at the General Sessions were devoted to the doctrinal aspects and implications of the liturgy in the life of the Church and of its individual members. The second half of the book contains the addresses given at the Sectional Sessions and here we have some extremely valuable directions, based on experience, for the teaching of the liturgy in schools, both secondary and primary, and for its practical realization in parochial life. Priests and teachers will find this book of real assistance to them in their efforts to make the liturgy a vital factor in the life of all.

One final word of congratulations to the organizers of the Litur-

¹*Australian Liturgical Week*. Xavier College, Melbourne. 3rd-7th January, 1955. The Advocate Press, Melbourne. pp 224. Price 18/-.

gical Week, and may it be the first of a regular series. These gatherings have flourished in other countries, and there is surely no reason to believe that the Catholics of Australia are no less zealous to promote the Glory of God than other members of the Mystical Body of Christ.

P. L. MURPHY.

Homiletics

HUMILITY AND MEMBERSHIP OF THE CHURCH

The more one studies the Epistles of St. Paul, the more one feels with St. Chrysostom what a great blessing it is to love this inspired theology of the Apostle of the Gentiles. The words of Chrysostom are well known, but they will bear repetition. They stand at the head of his series of 33 magnificent homilies on the Epistle to the Romans. They also constitute one of the most stimulating pages of a work which St. Isidore of Pelusium judged so highly as to say (with some exaggeration, no doubt) that, if St. Paul were to explain and expand his own thought in elegant Greek, he would scarcely have done better. Let us listen to the Prince of Sacred Orators and of Pauline Exegesis:

"As I hear again and again the Epistles of Saint Paul, and that twice a week, and often three or four times, that is, whenever we celebrate the memory of the holy martyrs, I rejoice at the sound of this spiritual trumpet. I get roused and get warmed with desire on recognising the voice so dear to me. I all but see him present before my eyes, and imagine him conversing with me.

"But I feel grieved and pained that all do not know this man as they ought to know him. There are even some so ignorant of him as not to know clearly the number of his Epistles. And this comes not through lack of education, but because they have not the wish to converse continually with this man.

"Let me speak of myself. Whatever I know, if I know anything, has not come to me from natural ability or sharpness of wit, but from my continual attachment to St. Paul and my great love of him. Love leads to knowledge of all the secrets of the beloved, because the lover is interested. This was said by the blessed Apostle himself, when he wrote to the Philippians. *"Indeed, I have a right to hold such good feelings regarding all of you, because I have you in my heart, all of you who are in fellowship with me in my imprisonment, and in the defence and confirmation of the Gospel (1:7).*

"In this way, you also (Chrysostom continues), if you be willing to apply yourselves with an eager mind to the reading of St. Paul, will need no other instruction. For the word of Christ is true, which says: *Seek and ye shall find; knock and it shall be opened to you . . .*

"I know for certain that countless evils have arisen from nothing else but ignorance of the Scriptures; from this it is that the plague of heresies has sprung; from this are negligent lives; from this labours

that are without result. For as men deprived of the daylight would surely not walk aright, so likewise they that do not look to the brilliant rays of the divine Scriptures must needs be often and constantly sinning, since they are walking in the worst darkness.

"That this may not happen, let us keep our eyes open to the shining brightness of the Apostle's words, for this man's language shone like the sun, and above all the others he abounded in the word of doctrine." (*Argumentum Ep. ad Romanos*).

The little section of the Epistle to the Romans (XII, 3-8), which is the subject of this contribution, would itself, as a sample, be sufficient to justify enthusiasm like that of the Bishop of Constantinople. Let us first give the text in translation, indicating the divisions which will help us to understand it. It naturally falls into three little parts, which we may entitle: (a) the humility of moderate or modest self-valuation; (b) organic diversity of members and functions in the Church; (c) each man in his own competence.

(a) "In the name of the grace which has been given to me I say to each one amongst you not to overesteem yourselves beyond the esteem you ought to have, but to esteem yourselves according to a sober measure of estimation, each one according to the measure of faith which God has apportioned to him.

(b) For, just as in one body we have many members, and the members have not all the same function, so also we, though we are many, form only one body in Christ, being each individually members one of the other.

(c) Furnished according to the grace given to us, with different gifts, it may be prophecy, according to the proportion of our faith;

or (it may be) service, in serving;

or the one who teaches, in teaching;

or the one who exhorts, in exhortation;

the one who gives (must do so) with simplicity;

the one who presides, with diligence;

the one who shows mercy with cheerfulness."

We have kept as close to the letter as possible, for a translation should reflect, as far as English allows, the peculiarities of St. Paul's style. As we noted in our first article, the syntax of this part of the Epistle is a bit loose and conversational. This may be noted here in the septenary of charismata especially in the third or (c) subdivision. We have simply translated. It belongs to the expounder, not to the translator, to paraphrase and explain.

(a) The grace in the name of which St. Paul speaks is the

Apostolate. He was not the founder of the Church of Rome, and he certainly does not address St. Peter, of whose presence in Rome, at the time of writing, the Epistle knows nothing. The Apostle addresses all and each, and he has a perfect right to do so in virtue of his apostolic authority. In other words he addresses the whole community without any distinction of persons. His advice is both general and particular, and the particular is naturally for those to whom it belongs, prophet or teacher or almoner, as the case may be.

The general principle, which is basic and applies to everyone without exception, is that each individual should have a right conception of his place and keep to it. Each one in his place, each one at his task, each one giving the Church the benefit of his gift. The pride which inspires arrogation of functions which are beyond the particular individual is to be kept far away from our lives. St. Paul's phrasing of his rule is brilliant, for he plays on the Greek verb *phronein*, which means "to think," or more often to "have a certain attitude of mind." Lofty thinking or proud high-mindedness is a vicious excess. It goes beyond the proper personal limit; the Christian's endeavour should be to keep in the "safe thinking" of truth. This in Greek is *sophronein*. We have tried to render the Greek phrase as literally and as close to the Apostle's alliterations as possible: "No one must *over-estimate* himself beyond his due *esteem*, but *esteem* himself to the degree of *sober esteem*."

This is a golden rule. The disastrous effects of neglecting it may be illustrated by a story from the Old Testament. When Judas Machabeus was having the great series of successes of his early campaigns, the armies of Israel having passed into Galilee and Galaad, Joseph the son of Zacharias and Azarias, captains in Juda, were moved by ambition, and wanted to make a name for themselves. They went into battle and were badly defeated—"and there was a great overthrow of the people: because they did not hearken to Judas, thinking that they should do manfully. But they were not of the seed of those men by whom salvation was brought to Israel." They should have kept their place.

"Each one (must hold himself) as God has portioned out to him the measure of faith." In other words the rule of personal activity is the measure of faith which one has received from God. What is this measure of faith? Is faith to be understood as the theological virtue which is the beginning, the root and foundation of the Christian life? In this present context, it cannot be precisely that, although the theological virtue is the basic power. Faith here is the special religious

endowment of the individual enabling him to fulfil his function in the Church. It is the assemblage of gifts which come as the fruit of faith, whether these gifts be charismatic or not, for instance, the faith that moves mountains. Faith here is the impelling power of the Holy Spirit given to this particular individual. It is of the particular sort and in the particular degree that God wills. Just as in the natural order no one should extend his activity into fields for which his natural talents are not made, so in the supernatural order no one should go outside of his grace or beyond it. The stimuli of ambition or envy may entice that way, but a man should keep his place and measure. That does not prevent him from praying that his gifts may be increased, or praying that he should receive others as well. St. Thérèse of Lisieux prayed for the power of expressing herself in verse, and she got it. Similarly Bernardine, of Siena, obtained by prayer from God a preacher's voice.

(b) The Church is an organic body, so that no one in it works for himself alone. Diversity of functions according to the variety of members or organs is of the very essence of an organic body. So Christians, numerous though they be, are one body in Christ. We now call it the "mystical" body. In three places especially St. Paul treats of this body which is the Church: most fully in 1. Cor. XII, here in this place, and in the Epistle to the Ephesians IV. In Corinthians and Romans no mention is made of Christ as head of the body; the unity of the body in Christ seems to be attributed to the Spirit of Christ which is the Holy Ghost. The development of the concept as that of a body with Christ as head belongs to the Captivity Letters (Ephesians, Colossians). Both in the earlier and the later conception the truth is the same. Christ is the centre of the body's life and activity.

The three things noted in the physical body, namely, the unity of the organism, the plurality of the organs, the diversity of organic functions are found analogously in the mystical body. The interdependence of functions is stressed more fully by the Apostle in the mystical body, for he says that "we are members each singly (indeed of the body, but thereby) members one of the other," the exchange of services between the members being thus emphasised. As St. Thomas says rather quaintly: "Every member or organ has its own proper act and power; inasmuch, therefore, as one member by its power and act helps another, it is said to be a member of the other, and so the foot is a member of the eye, because it *carries* the eye; and the eye is a member of the foot, because it *guides* the foot. *The eye cannot say to the hands I have no need of you.* Thus even in the mystical body

he who has received the grace of prophecy needs him who has received the grace of healing, and thus in all the rest. Hence, while a christian serves another according to the grace given him, he becomes a member of the other. *Bear one another's burdens.*" And the Holy Doctor very aptly quotes also 1 Peter 4:10.

(c) The gifts of the Spirit are, as it were, the organic powers of the members, and St. Paul now recommends the good use of the gifts, so that we should understand in each of the seven instances adduced some phrase like "Let it be used." Thus we have seven recommendations arranged, according to stylistic turns of phrase, in the combination 2 + 2 + 3.

St. Paul speaks of Charismata or *gratiae gratis datae*, that is, the graces given so abundantly in the early Church in view of the necessities of its youthful development. They were not *per se* sanctifying for the individual who received one or other or several of them, but they were for the utility of others. What the Apostle, however, says of these gifts can be applied by way of analogy to certain religious aptitudes belonging to graces of state, to certain spiritual abilities, to certain propensities towards special action for the good of souls.

"Having charismata then according to the grace given to us, and having *different* charismata," (let us use them properly). Two of the seven mentioned are more generic and are expressed by abstract nouns. They are "prophecy" and "diakonia" or service. They seem to be types of grace corresponding to what we call the spiritual and corporal words of mercy. "Prophecy" is described in 1 Corinthians 12:3f as a gift of inspired speech which edifies, exhorts and encourages. Since it included teaching and exhortation, it seems that the next pair of charismata expressed participially: "He who teaches (let him be) in teaching" — "he who exhorts (let him be) in exhortation," are closely related to prophecy. Similarly, the triad of ministrations, also expressed participially: "He who gives (let him do so) with simplicity; he who presides (let him do so) with diligence; he who shows mercy (let him do so) with cheerfulness"—these three fall under the denomination of "diakonia," ministry, or service. There is no reason to think that St. Paul in "diakonia" includes the hierarchical office of deacon. He has in mind rather persons like the men of the St. Vincent de Paul Society.

Prophecy is to be exercised *secundum rationem fidei*. No doubt *ratio* translates the Greek word *analogia* substantially, but its signification is so wide that it involves ambiguity. The Greek Fathers and modern commentators take *analogia* to mean "measure." But in what sense is faith the specific measure of the Prophet's activity. Some, like

Lagrange, make the measure an objective standard and translate: "in harmony with the faith." It is only just, however, to the great Dominican that he adds: "It would be an exaggeration to understand that objectivity in the sense rendered by the phrase: 'according to the rule of faith' or 'in conformity with the formulae of faith'. It is sufficient to say with Thomas: *Secundum rationem fidei, id est non in vanum, sed ut per hoc fides confirmetur; non autem contra fiden.*

This interpretation has its probability; and, in any case, it announces a true rule for any religious speaker or teacher, namely, that he should keep to the orthodox rule of the Church's doctrine. The context, however, seems to move in the domain of subjective dispositions. It is a matter of keeping within the proportions of a grace received. Faith, therefore, in this place is the special kind of charismatic efflorescence that the Prophet possesses. St. Paul means that the Prophet should control his thoughts according to the measure or proportion of the grace working in him and not mix his own personal views with what the Spirit gives him. The Apostle supposes that the Prophet really has a charism and he must control it according to the measure of his grace.

This rule of measure or limitation is summarily given for the charism of service. "Service should be concerned with serving." Service has a very wide meaning, and its limitation depended on the kind of service one was called to exercise. Here in our text Prophecy seems to draw to it, as spiritual works of instruction, the function of didascalos or teacher and that of exhorter or consoler. Diakonia or service, on the other hand, holds the paternity of the three corporal works of succour: giving, presiding, showing mercy.

For the two teaching charisms only a circumscription of the sphere of activity is given: "He who teaches let him be a teacher; he who exhorts let him be intent on exhortation." We are reminded of the homely proverb: "Let the shoemaker stick to his last." The spirit of St. Paul's advice would keep us from many faults. A preacher of the word of God is not an entertainer; a retreat-master is not brought in to tell the community funny stories.

The last three charisms evidently belong to one and the same domain of temporal beneficence. The mode of exercising them is indicated. They are in descending order in their approach to the misery of those to be helped.

First comes the giver. He is a person who gives alms out of his own possessions. He ought to do so with simplicity, that is to say, out of goodness of heart, for the sake of giving (which is a blessing

in itself), without any *arrière-pensée* of self interest, without thought of making a good figure on a subscription list.

The one who presides is the person who looks after the distribution of organised charity. The diligence which he should show would include zeal for the collection of alms and sedulous care in the matter of their good administration.

The last man of the triad, the one who shows mercy, is in immediate contact with the needy one. He ought to be like the sunshine, showing the generosity of God's merciful goodness even in the joy of his face. The smile can be a greater gift than the gift itself.

W. LEONARD.

Notes

A MID-CENTURY SURVEY OF THE BIBLE

In June, 1954, "*The Times*", London, published a supplement on the Bible; it was priced at 1/- sterling. The twenty-nine articles, which appeared in the supplement, have now been published in book form at a much higher price, though certainly, in more elaborate and lasting style.¹ The introduction of the book claims that it presents in full, articles which had had to be curtailed in the original issue through lack of space, and also, that it has added some new material. Very little extra material, however, does appear. There is a notable addition by G. D. Driver to his article on the Revised Version, by way of criticism and appreciation of the new American Revised Standard Version, as well as expansion in a quite remarkable and sympathetic Introduction. One or two additional sentences, here and there, clarify what was obscure — this is particularly true in "The Old Testament Hebrew Text", where some extra material is helpful.

Twenty articles are from non-Catholic clergymen; two Catholic priests, Monsignor Knox and Fr. Bullough, O.P., write well on "St. Paul" and "English Versions since 1611" respectively; four distinguished lay professors from Oxford and Cambridge contribute. The field covered is rather extensive: Language of the Bible, Archeology, Manuscripts, Translations, Editions, Religious, Literary, Musical and Social applications. The object of the enterprise "was to make it possible for thoughtful readers without specialist learning, as well as for scholars to get an overall picture of how Bible studies have progressed." Let it be said that, as far as the Catholic non-specialist reader is concerned, the object is achieved with qualified success. This result must, no doubt, be expected in such a work as this, written as it is, for the most part, by non-Catholics for a predominantly non-Catholic public.

In general, the reason for such qualification is that in the articles dealing with the Pentateuch, the attitude adopted involves the denial of Mosaic authorship (cf. Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture, §§ 135 b, h, i-t; ACR., July, 1948, pp. 180-183). Indeed, on this, as well as on such matters as the historicity of Esther, Judith, Tobias or Daniel (in whatever way we understand this historicity), or the nature of Ecclesiastes, for example, there is an unfortunate and well-nigh total disregard for the position and findings of Catholic scholarship. With

¹THE BIBLE TODAY, considered by Christian Scholars. London, 1955. Eyre & Spottiswoode Ltd. 208pp. 25/- (Eng.).

regard to the New Testament, one cannot but be struck by the fact that the divinity of Christ is not even once contemplated; there are occasions, too, when, by what seem to be ingenious exegetical contortions, Christ's miracles are made to vanish from the realms of reality (cf. the interpretation of the casting out of devils, p. 90, or the resurrection, p. 95). The basic general weakness of the book, however, consists, in the opinion of this reviewer, in its failure to answer the question: what is the Bible? In other words, Biblical Inspiration is never treated of, and the "thoughtful reader" might well conclude that the Bible is essentially nothing more than a merely human work, sublime and inspiring it is true, to be judged solely by the same criteria as would be applied to any other book of mere human authorship (cf. Introduction, p.xiv). The only time the unique character of the Bible is referred to, is in passing, and that by way of a quote from St. Augustine (p. 192).

This criticism, however, must not be understood as belittling the value of so much in this book. D. Winton Thomas, Regius Professor of Hebrew, Cambridge, covers "The languages of the Old Testament" admirably; his paragraph on the characteristics of Hebrew language and thought is first class. The article on "The O.T. world" is praiseworthy. Readers of this review will be interested in the reference to the later dating of Hammurabi, and therefore, according to many, of Abraham. The author opts for 1686 B.C. as the date of Hammurabi's death. In this he sides with Professor Albright against Professor Sidney Smith, Sir Leonard Woolley, and H. S. Hooke (p. 19), who postulate a slightly earlier date, as well as against those who would date Abraham about 2000 B.C. (cf. Woolley's, *A Forgotten Kingdom*, a Pelican book, pp.66-67, and Er. Power, S.J., in the CCHS., §59e).

Hooke's "Archeology and the Bible" presents a very good general view of this important matter. The contributions of modern archeological discoveries to Biblical knowledge are enormous. The excavations at Ur, for instance, have shown us for the first time, "what sort of houses men lived in, what household utensils they used, what gods they worshipped, how they conducted their business correspondence; in short, all the details of daily life in the age of Abraham . . ." (p. 16. cf. Woolley, *Ur of the Chaldees*, a Pelican book). The biblical importance of the Ras Shamra tablets are well known. For example, technical sacrificial terms in them show that the sacrificial ritual of the Hebrews was not, as it was so confidently asserted not too long ago, a post-exilic priestly invention, but had its roots in early Canaanite ritual. The ordinary reader could appreciate the significance of this, by turning to Fr. Jones's excellent chapter in his little book, "*Unless some man show me,*" pp.

125-135. Archeology has shown, too, that Genesis reflects faithfully "the life and customs of Canaan in the first half of the second millenium B.C." (p. 20 and cf. H. H. Rowley in his article on p. 28).

The criteria for N.T. canonicity, "the consent of the faithful" (pp. 83-84), or "the inherent authority of the books" (pp. 124-125), would not satisfy a Harnack for instance, nor, for that matter, an Iraneus; besides tending to over-simplify an involved question, it does not get to the root of the matter.

"Jew and Greek" by the Rev. C. H. Dodd, the well-known author of a really remarkable work on the Gospel of St. John, reflects all the authority and scholarship of this distinguished writer. But, somehow or other, one is left wondering whether St. John would have subscribed to Dodd's genesis of the Logos. Was the Christian idea of the Logos the outcome of a divine revelation in the strict sense of the word, or was it — granted "the infusion of the divine spirit mediated through Jesus," granted, too, the right atmosphere, and "heightened awareness" — an inevitable cultural emergence? And would St. John feel at home with or even recognise, the "word made flesh" of pp. 119-120? Was Christ truly God and truly man? Dr. Dodd leaves these questions, so it seems, unanswered; and after all, they are questions which call for an unequivocal answer.

The articles on the English Bible are all well done. One or two uncalled-for anti-Roman outbursts from Dr. Mozley mar the otherwise charitable tone of the book. Here it is perhaps interesting to mention, that Fr. Hugh Pope, O.P., who, following Cardinal Gasquet, insisted in his "Aids" that the English Bibles seen by St. Thomas More in the great libraries were not Wycliffite, would most likely have changed his views before his death, and agreed with Dr. Mozley, and Sir Frederick Kenyon ("*Our Bible and the Ancient Mss*", p.202, and p.209). This, at any rate, seems to be the suggestion of Fr. Bullough on p. 62, n.1., in "*English Versions of the Bible*," by Pope-Bullough. The political genius of William Cecil, "the chief architect of the Reformation", is curiously illustrated in his attitude to the Geneva Bible, p. 136. "The origins of the Authorized Version", by Norman Sykes, Cambridge, "The Revised Version" by G. D. Driver, and Fr. Bullough's article are all fine summaries. We found "*Sortes Biblicae*" by Rev. C. Jenkins, both amusing and entertaining.

An excellent index facilitates reference; thirty-seven illustrations add interest and worth to the book. Perhaps the value of the book would have been enhanced by the inclusion of a select bibliography at the conclusion of each article, as well as by naming some of the illustra-

tions, e.g., The Chester Beatty codex, the John Ryland's N.T. ms. This is a book which every student of Scripture should possess, for it does achieve its object of giving an overall picture of how Biblical studies have progressed, at least among non-Catholic Christian scholars.

H. G. DAVIS.

BEFORE THE CATASTROPHE

The attack made by Thomas Cromwell, acting under Henry VIII's orders, on the English monasteries has always aroused keen interest. Reading the *Letters relating to the Suppression of Monasteries*, edited by Wright, or the brilliant book by Baskerville, one feels if what they say is true, much would be forgiven the spoilers of the monasteries. On the other hand, Cardinal Gasquet painted a milder picture of monastic lives and morals, fairly pointing out the bias of Cromwell's agents, and, also, the dark morality of many of the investigators. Some doubts have risen over the years concerning the veracity of Gasquet's historical method, and the *Times Literary Supplement* of recent years has had many able letters on this point. When Henry VIII began proceedings against the monks and friars, their fate was decided. The great establishments have perished. Sometimes a ruin remains to worry the conscience of the beholder; or their buildings have passed to other uses; many monastic foundations are but a name. Did they deserve their former fame, or did they merit the tragedy of their death? In the 1920's Professor Coulton began his immense indictment of the religious in the Middle Ages, notably in his vast work in five volumes, *Five Centuries of Religion*, which was concerned not only with English religious houses but embraced also Continental monasticism. Readers will remember the debates aroused by the Cambridge professor's method and purpose. Following Coulton's time, another Cambridge pen has been composing a *magnum opus* on the life and influence of English monks and religious. In 1940, Dom David Knowles published the first volume of a survey of the subject from the 10th century to the catastrophe in the 16th centry. His first volume, *The Monastic Order in England* . . . 943-1216 (Cambridge, 1940. Reprinted in 1949 and 1950) saw the beginning of what many English historians, Catholic and non-Catholic alike, considered as likely to be the fairest and best informed account of the great subject, by one who knew the monastic life from within, whose cool approach, combined with accurate knowledge, showed clearly that he sought the truth and nothing but the truth. Delayed by the war, the second volume, *The Religious Orders in*

England (Cambridge, 1948), appeared eight years later, by which time Knowles had become Professor of Medieval History at Cambridge. In that volume, the historian carried the account up to the beginning of the 14th century. Last year, his eagerly awaited book on the end of the Middle Ages was printed (*The Religious Orders in England*, vol. II. *The End of the Middle Ages*, Cambridge, 1955). Dom David Knowles had advanced by 1955 to the lofty position of Fellow of Peterhouse and Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Cambridge. It is the purpose of this note to bring to notice of our readers some of the main conclusions of this latest volume in Knowles' great work.

Before attempting a verdict on the rights, or wrongs, of the Henrician suppression, it is absolutely essential to know the state of affairs in monastic and religious life in the centuries preceding the fateful 16th century. Knowles writes in a detached manner. He has no axe to grind. With a dignified, urbane style, which in these fevered years of controversy and propaganda is a silent, but most telling, rebuke, he considers the ups and downs of religious life, which being made up of men and women, has necessarily, inevitably, its full share of human weakness and failing.

The Constitution issued in 1336 by Pope Benedict XII, the builder of the Palace of the Popes at Avignon, was momentous for the English Black Monks. The French pope, "in many ways the most distinguished of the popes of the fourteenth century after the death of Boniface VIII," realizing the dangers of the lack of central control, urged the English Black Monks of Canterbury and Durham to unite their provinces under a President, who could control the efforts and lives of the monks throughout England. Such a union was effected (indeed, it has persisted, and the English Benedictines gladly acknowledge their debt to Benedict XII's wise plan). Yet at the time the President was deprived in practice of all effective power. Here Dom Knowles feels was the beginning of the tragedy, for "the rhythm of the monastic life shows, during the three centuries concerned, a slow but continuous tendency to slacken, save in two or three periods of twenty years."

The great plague of 1348-9, the Black Death, has often been blamed, especially from the end of the 19th century, for the subsequent decadence of religious life. Never again, so the theory ran, were the monastic numbers made up, so that the vitality of religious life was sapped, even though the majestic foundations remained. The loss, indeed, was very great, but Knowles points out that those most con-

cerned, the monks, did not seem to have thought "an epoch had ended." Indeed, in a short time building resumed at Gloucester and Ely, while at Oxford the Black Monks of Canterbury and Durham became more fixed. As for numbers, the end of the 14th century saw "a general, if not spectacular rise . . ." Yet one wonders if the sudden loss of personnel is not a cause of the dearth of distinguished men and women in the religious life of the period, the most barren period of their long history in England. It was the fate of the English Church during this important period that no saint appeared, no outstanding scholar (save Netter, the Carmelite Oxford scholar), and from the ranks of religious women no names to be remembered from St. Margaret in the XIth century to Mary Ward in the 17th century, except the honoured names of Dame Juliana of Norwich and the delightful Margery Kempe, neither of whom, Knowles writes, were "religious" in the technical sense.

Yet the building went on, even up to 1500, when the Lady Chapel at Gloucester was finished. Still names among the abbots are remembered, for example, that of Thomas de la Mare, abbot of St. Albans in 1349 at the height of the Black Death. He was a firm upholder of the privileges of his monastery. He built magnificently, but as Knowles says: "Yet if we compare de la Mare . . . with Wolsey and Cardinal d'Amboise . . . the man and his works stand in strong contrast. In the abbot's expenses there was no directly personal luxury and little personal display; his gifts adorned the abbey church or added to the amenities of the monastery . . . they were for the enjoyment of many and would, had the fates been more kind, have remained for the eyes of posterity till they crumbled". He was a man of prayer and ascetic in his life, while remaining the excellent host with the easy certainty of a man of breeding. He died in 1396. He seems to have had no inkling of the ideas abroad which would cause his world to crumble. Dom Knowles, with grave and dignified words, takes his leave of de la mare, in this fashion: "He had led in a certain sense, a double life. That of the great prelate was open for all to see; of the other how much, we may wonder, did the eyes of a Wyclif, a Langland or a Chaucer perceive, when they fell upon the abbot of St. Alban's riding from London to Westminster to take precedence of all the abbots of England? Did they know of the hair-shirt, the vigils and the fastings? We cannot say, nor do we ourselves know how many of the abbots of England, in an age when the medieval world and its faiths were crumbling, lived as devoutly and as austerely. We can, however, well say that had many thus lived in the days of Henry VIII their Order would not have passed,

and would not have deserved to pass, so easily from the English scene", Wyclif, Langland and Chaucer! The criticism of the monks and of the four orders of friars had began, and more particularly, of the friars, who both by reason of their habitual mingling with the people and by reason of their intrusion into the organization of the diocese and parish" drew a good deal of attention. The Friars Minor were in a delicate position. Some of them made extravagant claims on behalf of mendicancy, alleging that the friars as the leaders of the new spiritual era, would eliminate the hierarchy and the existing ecclesiastical organization. This extreme view led to a long and unfortunate controversy with the secular clergy. Moreover, within their own ranks the question of poverty let to bitter quarrels over the merits of absolute poverty and corporate ownership.

Economically, the work of the monasteries had long passed its apogee. No longer did the monks, even the White Monks, the Cistercians, till the soil themselves. Symptomatic was the rapid decline among the White Monks of the *conversi*, the lay-brothers, whose activities and lives had been hard to control. The monks found it easier to let their manors and farms to the local gentry, forming thus a class who had everything to profit by the collapse of the monastic system. This, with the conflicts caused by the friars, opened the way to a new thing in English religious life, the virulent criticism of the religious. Dom Knowles has written in a most acute manner on the motives and meaning of the satires and attacks of Wyclif, Langland and Chaucer, from the last of whom, generations not only of Englishmen, but of all those who have inherited the great English civilisation, have learnt what a monk and a friar were like in the old days. The picture of the monks and friars is no doubt partial. They passed over a Walter Hilton, a Prior John, who were both men of deep mysticism, they ignored the virtues of a de la Mare, yet Dom Knowles writes: ". . . it is hard to escape the conviction that the three writers . . . are in their different ways, witnesses to a corruption among the Mendicants, and a worldliness among the black monks . . ." It lay within the bishop's powers to correct abuses in the non-exempt houses, while visitation of the exempt monasteries were carried out by the competent superiors, for instance, the notable visitations made by Abbot de la Mare at the end of the 14th century. It must be remembered that in the records of the visitations, it is only the abuses that are recorded. They stand out in bold relief, while the good lives of many are unmentioned, because they simply carried out the duties of their state. Yet Dom Knowles is puzzled by the failure

of visiting prelates to remove unworthy superiors. He gives examples of a nature which are alarming. For instance, at Peterborough in 1466 the abbot "was charged not only with worldliness, laxity . . . but with . . . adultery with three women." The abbot, in question, was allowed by the bishop to continue in office after due penance. Indeed, the penances inflicted were a tribute to episcopal leniency. A canon of Markby, convicted of a long-standing criminal intercourse with a woman by whom he had two children, escaped with a mild dietary penance and some vocal prayers, while an extremely disorderly fellow-canon, suspected of homosexual practices, got off with a caution." It was, also, unfortunate that by the opening of the 15th century, the typical diocesan bishop had become a royal servant, a great civil servant to whom the King entrusted state affairs. This led to a necessary lack of interest with the religious world, when the "religious houses, for their part, were undoubtedly several degrees more distant from fervour than they had been in 1300 . . . No doubt there were still a number of the greater monasteries — St. Alban's, Durham, Christ Church — where a dignified life was still lived, but it must be confessed that the picture given at Peterborough and Ramsey is not a bright one." King Henry V did a service to monastic life by the suppression of the "alien" priories, small houses depending on a Continental monastery, which were often disorderly. Houses that lost their purpose and their religious spirit were suppressed by Wolsey and St. John Fisher in early years of the 16th century.

Dom Knowles, with his fairness, then records the known examples who are an honour to their profession by their sanctity. In a masterly way, he surveys the literary and theological work of the monks and friars.

The world was changing around them, economically and intellectually. Unhappily, they failed to see this and "let olde thinges pace". Except for Henry VIII's brusque change, the reforming and sane spirit of the Council of Trent might have re-vitalized the monastic life which had played so prominent a part in English life. Dom Knowles quotes with approval the words of the saintly Jesuit of the 17th century, Lallemand, warning his novices that a "religious order . . . is verging upon its final decline when the number of the lukewarm begins to equal that of the perfect." "These measured words." Dom Knowles concludes ". . . may be set before the reader who takes his backward glance upon the religious orders of England in the last centuries of peace, before the swelling of Jordan; the time of ease that was soon to be followed by

the day when Jerusalem was searched with lighted candles, and visitation made upon men that were settled upon their lees."

Dom Knowles, in a final volume, will conclude his great work.

T. VEECH

*

*

*

*

AT THE SCHOOL OF ST. THERESE OF THE CHILD JESUS: Excerpts translated by the Rev. Michael Collins, S.M.A. Dublin, Gill & Son, 1952. pp 90, 3/6 in Ireland.

The complete wording on the cover of this booklet tells us that it contains St. Therese's "true doctrine explained by herself and supported by the writings of Doctors and Theologians of Holy Church." Also that the translator worked in collaboration with the Carmel of Kilmacud, Co., Dublin. We are further informed that the translation is from the sixth French edition, which like the first edition in 1927, carries as preface a letter to Mother Agnes of Lisieux from the Superior of the Bayeux Seminary, who was Promoter of the Faith in the Process of the Canonization of St. Therese. From this preface and from several other prefatory letters from ecclesiastics, we learn that this precious booklet is the thoughtful compilation of none other than Mother Agnes herself, who knew, beyond all others, the distinctive character of St. Therese's sanctity.

Briefly described, the booklet contains a dialogue between the saint and a soul, attracted by the "little way" of sanctity but seeking enlightenment. The queries are short, giving space to the doctrine of St. Therese as expressed in her writings. What enriches the book, making it something far more than a collection of excerpts with which we are familiar, is its collating of parallel passages from spiritual classics. We quote merely the first passage, noted as being in its turn a quotation from St. Augustine (more likely a gloss), in a book of meditations by a hermit of Sept Fons. Students of St. Therese's writing will see the application: "Be not afraid to undertake this course and to enter on the straight and narrow way, because Jesus Christ Who calls you to come after Him, to carry your cross and to follow Him, will Himself carry you in His arms. Run, He says, but it is I Who will carry you."

M.O.

Book Reviews

THE UNITY OF PHILOSOPHICAL EXPERIENCE, by Etienne Gilson. First published, October 1938, reprinted 1955 by Sheed and Ward Ltd., London. pp. 340. English price, 16/-.

The German Order of Merit has just been conferred on Etienne Gilson for his scholarly work in medieval thought. Sharing in this rare honour are only four Non-German Fellows, among whom, incidentally, is Australian-born Gilbert Murray; moreover, Paris-born Gilson combines this new honour with the highest decorations from his own country and from academic circles all over the world. He is one of the founders of the Institute of Medieval Studies at Toronto, where he now resides and lectures. Several times he has been called upon to take world-renowned series of lectures; his Gifford lectures of 1931-32 form his book "The Spirit of Medieval Philosophy."

Similarly, the present book is made up of his William James' Lectures at Harvard in 1936-37. It speaks well for their value that there is still so great a demand for them. Their aim was to take certain problems in philosophy and show that the answers given to them by the great philosophers of all ages give evidence of a striking unity. (We think immediately of how Kant founded his "Copernican Revolution" upon precisely the denial of such a unity.) Gilson is a recognised authority on Descartes and gives us in these lectures a hundred pages devoted to the analysis of Descartes' system and to the evil effect of Cartesianism.

The chapter on Kant is entitled: "The Physicism of Kant". That philosopher began by rejecting the mathematicism of Descartes, only to fall into the error of shifting from mathematics to physics. He concluded: "The true method of metaphysics is fundamentally the same as that which Newton has introduced into natural science, and which has yielded such fruitful results." Newton considered the existence of an absolute space and an absolute time as necessarily required by his physics; consequently, Kant decreed that man should be credited with two forms of sensible intuition: space and time, in which all the objects of knowledge are given to the understanding. Kant considered that our understanding is equipped with *a priori* principles, similar to the sense intuitions of space and time; among these are the notions of substance and of causality, and by means of these various objects are connected by the mind. They are called categories; they are not derived from experience, they make it. Hence for Kant metaphysics, which depends upon such principles, is an illusion. It is the attempt to know reality as it is apart from the active and transforming role of the human mind; and precisely because the mind is thus necessarily moulding experience metaphysics is seeking an unattainable goal. Having despaired of speculative philosophy, Kant turned to the practical reason and adopted a set of affirmations — the freedom of the will, the immortality of the soul, the existence of God — which, although for him rationally undemonstrable, are postulated as true by the exigencies of moral life. He

thus combined a physicism with a moralism, but failed to unite them harmoniously. If man is, as Kant thinks, the cause of the principle of causality present in the world, why should his own understanding erect causal necessity as a permanent hindrance to his own free will?

In his concluding lecture,¹ Gilson reviewing Kant's condemnation of metaphysics, says: "it was not the consequence of any personal attempt to reach the foundation of metaphysical knowledge. Kant busied himself with questions about metaphysics, but he had no metaphysical interests of his own. Even during the first part of his career there was always some book between this professor and reality. To him, nature was in the books of Newton, and metaphysics in the books of Wolff . . . Such, to Kant, was metaphysics; a second-hand knowledge, for which he was no more personally responsible than for the physics of Newton."

These words of Gilson are quoted by Gavin Ardley.² This author correctly assesses Gilson's strictures on Kant for the latter's condemnation of metaphysics without sufficient real knowledge of it. But in no sense does Gilson lend support to the novel thesis that Gavin Ardley sets out to prove. His thesis is briefly this : Kant by his teaching that physics is a science of the phenomenal, and not the real, order has made the greatest contribution to the *philosophia perennis* since St. Thomas.

It is true that some modern scholastics have been too ready to consider the latest findings of science as indubitably revealing the real ontological structure of the material world; such philosophers have hurriedly and inadvisably abandoned Hylomorphism and substituted in its place Hylosystemism; it is also true that some Catholic philosophers, such as Professor Whittaker, have considered metaphysics as being built upon and forming an integral part with physics, and have clamoured for a new metaphysics built upon the new physics. Nevertheless, a correct appreciation of the different provinces of physics and metaphysics is not our legacy from Kant, but from St. Thomas. Kant would say that physics is the science of the phenomenal world, metaphysics of the noumenal world and hence unattainable. St. Thomas taught that metaphysics is based upon *being*, it is the science of the real. He warned us in his book: "De Caelo et Mundo", "The suppositions which astronomers have imagined are not to be accounted necessarily true. Although these hypotheses seem to account for the observed facts, we must not say that they are thereby proved to be facts, because perhaps it would be possible to explain the apparent movements of the stars by some other method which men have not yet excogitated."³ The hypotheses of the physicists, e.g. those regarding the constitution of the atom, contain a large subjective element; they are always subject to revision; but subject to these provisions, they represent a genuine attempt to portray the proximate causes of the real world. They differ from the findings of metaphysics, because these latter bring us to conclusions

¹pp. 316, 317.

²Aquinas and Kant, by Gavin Ardley. Longmans, London, 1950. p. 79n.

³Expositio in Librum Aristotelis de Caelo et Mundo, Liber 11, Cap. XII. Lect. XVII, n.2.

that are certain on the nature of being, its attributes and its Ultimate Cause.

There is no way more pleasant or more effective of reaching these conclusions of metaphysics than by following their historical development in these clear pages of Gilson.

F.A.M.

THE LOCAL SUPERIOR IN NON-EXEMPT CLERICAL CONGREGATIONS, by Robert E. McGrath, O.M.I., and LEGISLATION AND REQUIREMENTS FOR PERMISSIBLE COHABITATION IN INVALID MARRIAGES, by Rev. Bernard O. Sullivan. Catholic University of America Press. Washington, U.S.A. 1954. 2 doll. each.

We can congratulate the directors of the Faculty of Canon Law in the Catholic University of America for their enterprise in finding subjects of dissertation for doctoral candidates. These ones give opportunities to the candidates to show their mettle, and yet are of practical value.

The first Dissertation named above covers its matter competently, and good use is made of adequate apparatus. The history of Congregations of simple vows is traced as an introduction. Such congregations were suppressed a number of times and discouraged by pontifical legislation, but the force of circumstances was too strong, and they evolved in spite of opposition. It was not, however, till the time of the Code that they seem to have received full canonical recognition.

In recent years the non-jurisdictional authority of Religious superiors has often been discussed. The Code calls it "Dominativa"; commentators have wished to distinguish as well "domestic", "economic", Fr. McGrath prefers to use the one term used by the Code, "dominitiva", and to see in it various degrees. We recommend this dissertation to the superiors in question. It would be a very useful book for them, and they could find in it a helpful description of their rights and duties.

The second Dissertation deals with a situation which occasionally occurs in pastoral work. It is the case of an invalid marriage, where there is serious difficulty, amounting to moral impossibility, in separation. There is no question of condoning normal conjugal life in these circumstances, but would it be possible to permit such persons to continue to live together as brother and sister, and if so, what conditions, guarantees and authorisation would be required? An example would be an invalidly married person, who wishes to be received into the Catholic Church, or a Catholic in the same circumstances, who wishes to be admitted to the sacraments.

Fr. Sullivan has collected a great deal of relevant Canon Law and Moral Theology on the problem, commencing with Gratian and working through the classical authors up to the present day. He gathers from all this the "Fundamental Requirements for all Brother-Sister Cases". They are: No other solution possible; no grave scandal; no proximate voluntary occasion of sin; a proportionate reason, and proper permission of competent authority. Cases of priests invalidly married are reserved

to the Sacred Penitentiary. To the Ordinary are reserved all cases that are even probably public, and generally those which involve a former bond. Besides, the Ordinary could reserve other cases to himself. The pastor, even the confessor, may usually deal with cases which do not fall into any of these classes.

In an Appendix *Formulae* are printed which would be of use in collecting the necessary information where application to the Ordinary is required.

Modern canonists all assert that such "*Fraterna Cohabitatio*" is "*res plena periculis*", and "*rarissime permittenda*". Still cases can arise. This dissertation provides a very convenient collection of the texts concerning it, and a well-balanced exposition and discussion of the questions involved.

J.H.

* * * *

TWO PORTRAITS OF ST. TERESA OF LISIEUX, by Etienne Robo. Sands and Son, London. 1955. pp. 205. English price 9/6.

Father Etienne Robo is a French priest, born and brought up in the South of France, a contemporary of St. Teresa. He has worked as a parish priest in England in the diocese of Southwark for over 50 years.

The aim he set before himself in this book, as he says in the Introduction is to give "a restatement of the story of St. Teresa (all through the book this unfamiliar form of her name is used), made in the detached, objective and impartial spirit of an historian."

No book can lessen the greatness of "*The Little Flower*". In the whole history of the Church, perhaps, no saint has ever become so widely and so quickly known. The last three popes have singled her out for special praise. Many volumes have been written on her from every point of view, historical, theological, and psychological.

Several problems are recognised in all this, both by her supporters and by others who are at times critical of the saint herself, but more so of those round her. Up to very recently her sisters and others concerned in the story were alive. Her sister, Pauline, Mother Mary Agnes of Jesus, was confirmed as permanent superior of the Carmel of Lisieux till her death in 1950. It is only since then that a freer discussion of many points could take place. In the near future the Carmel of Lisieux is to give to the world two works long desired, and which should be of great help to students: a critical photogravure reproduction of the manuscript of the three versions of her Autobiography, and a volume of photographs.

Father Robo in his book deals with some of these problems, and although at least one reviewer has accused him of unfairness and unfriendliness (cf. Fr. Michael Day in "*Sicut Parvuli*", Oct. 1954), on the other hand, those who would desire to know St. Teresa will be moved by his book to admire and love her all the more on account of this calm and critical appreciation.

The "*Two Portraits*" are twofold. First, he considers photographs,

the conventional retouched picture, so widely reproduced and so familiar to us all, and an amateur "candid-camera" snap of the saint as a novice. The Carmel of Lisieux retains the copyright of the retouched picture, and did not allow our author to reproduce it. This drew from him a few lines of severe criticism, some of the few lines in the book which are regrettable:

"We have been refused permission to reproduce here their postcard of Teresa as a novice at the age of sixteen. This refusal is an answer. They dare not face the comment of the public when they see side by side the original and the fake" (36, 37). The retouching by Celine (Sister Genevieve, a sister of the saint), did, no doubt, take away the naturalness of the original. But it is also true that a casual snapshot might not give a true idea of its subject. We have all suffered from amateur photographers. The Carmel should not be accused of "faking" merely because they worked on such a photo, with the idea of giving to the world what they considered a better picture of their saint. It may be true that the retouching was not well done, and that it diminished the value of the picture.

Most of the book is concerned with two other portraits, the first, sketched by our author in 17 pages, he calls the "Popular Story". This represents her life as an unbroken series of sufferings, virtues and wonders, all described in a language rich in edification and sweetness. It is a pious "journalese", traditional especially among French hagiographers, and however inartistic, this portrait of our saint has won her world-wide popularity and has helped many. Fr. Robo's presentation of it is perhaps a bit oversimplified and over-drawn.

In his own portrait, which fills the greater part of the book, we see our saint with her weaknesses (she certainly had some neurotic tendencies), her stubborn strength of purpose (remember her efforts to enter Carmel at 15 despite all opposition); he draws attention to her conventional and stylized prose and poetry, and notes the embellishments her story may have got from her fellow-religious in their reminiscences and testimonies.

We see in this portrait a woman of great courage and strength, of practical common sense, bearing her heavy trials of body, mind and soul with an ever-increasing fortitude to the very end. Many problems are still not fully solved — for example, the character of the Prioress, Mother Marie de Gonzague, the attitude of the community of Lisieux to St. Teresa, the saint's own independence of spiritual direction, her pre-occupation with her own moods and reactions, and her indifference (the word is not too strong) to the feelings of her father (as when she entered Carmel in spite of the pain it caused him, now an aging man, stricken by severe mental illness).

Fr. Robo does not claim to have said the last word on these and other puzzling aspects of her story. He does, however, present the problems in a fair way, and his judgments are well worthy of consideration. The book, if carefully read, will help her clients to get nearer to the real St. Teresa, and should give them a greater admiration and devotion to her.

Those who may desire fuller information might consult the fine new book by von Balthasar. Besides, as a corrective to the unfavourable pictures drawn in the popular book of van der Meersch, there has been published in 1950 a French volume from a number of authors, "*La Petite Sainte Therese devant la Critique et devant les Textes*". (ed. St. Paul, Paris).

J.H.

*

*

*

*

"ONLY SON," by Walter Farrell, O.P. London; Sheed and Ward, 1955. pp. 244. 12/6 sterling.

Fr. Farrell won renown as a writer with his three-volume work, "A Companion to the Summa." The present work is a life of Christ, beginning from the Incarnation and ending with His final conquest of death. It is an account which is devotional and popular, yet apparently based on the best scientific works available.

Published posthumously, the book has an unique background in that the author died whilst writing the third last chapter, and yet completed the work himself. For it is a tribute to what he had written, that it was determined that the book should be completed, and so the necessary matter was taken from the "Companion." However, I fear that this solution to the difficulty was not altogether satisfactory. The last two chapters on the Death and Resurrection of Our Lord do not harmonize with the rest of the book; and we could hardly expect them to do so, because historical narrative is entirely different from the approach to the sacred events in such a book as the "Companion," where the story is presupposed rather than told. The alternative solution — that of asking someone else to bring the account to its conclusion — was considered by the publishers and rejected. It was thought that, since Fr. Farrell's style was so unique, the result would have been "a clash of styles to jar the reader's ear." This may have been verified to a certain extent, but I think that uniformity of approach is even more desirable and more fundamental than uniformity of mere literary style. Moreover, the reader's disappointment would have been avoided, when, on being conducted in a most masterly fashion to the very climax of the book, he comes (half way through a sentence) to the end of what Fr. Farrell had written and is apologetically informed that the rest of the book is only makeshift.

The first nine chapters are colourfully written, fine human sentiment being shown especially when Our Lord's infancy is being treated. Metaphors and similes are special features of the author's style. For example, he describes Our Lord's brief visits to Galilee as "tantalizing flicks of the rapier, searching out some weak spot in men's perverse defense against God."

Had Fr. Farrell been given the time to complete his book, it would undoubtedly have been one the best popular lives of Christ at present available.

B. F. B.

THE DEVIL'S HUNTING GROUNDS, by Harry Blamires, London, Longhans, Green & Co., 1954, pages 162. 10/9 (Australian price).

This is another example of the power of fantasy in exposing error. The author, to judge from the contents, is an Anglo-catholic, but, when he first depicts himself, the world and its sects lie behind and he is alone with his guardian angel after death. He tells how examination found him far from perfect and there arose the problem of occupying him until this was set right. Teaching was all he knew so his angel was told to show him the two chief colleges of the place, the "College for Gnostics" and the "Backward Believers Department", that he might take his choice. Thus he is able to describe the many christian intellectuals in Purgatory.

This general plan is very similar to that of *The Great Divorce* by Professor C. S. Lewis. Neither book is a treatise on Purgatory, but in this setting varied human types are easily grouped and examined. Besides, the lesson that what we make ourselves in life determines what we shall be after death is driven home without difficulty. But where all human evil and hypocrisy is treated by Professor Lewis, the present author attends mainly to intellectual ills among teachers of religion and students of theology. Gnostics, Modernists and Sentimentalists are his meat and he successfully uncovers the woolliness and sterility of much modern thought. Sometimes he is too blunt. Where suggestion would have served well, he produces an uncomfortably explicit statement, usually from the mouth of Lamiel, the angel. This spirit, by the way, is a colossal bore. It is hardly fair to an angel to give him a body like unto man's and yet make him talk with the bloodless logic of a passage from the *Summa*.

These things do not damage the book much. They are more than balanced by the author's descriptive power and his ability to present character clearly with a few words. Because of this, his book is not only instructive but very readable.

B.J.

*

*

*

*

LIFE OF CHRIST, by Giuseppe Ricciotti, popular edition translated by Alba Zizzamia, abridged and edited by Aloysius Croft. Mercier Press, 1955. pp. 396. Price 21/- stg.

When the New Testament scholar is described as a "critic" it usually means that he has abandoned the historical view of Christ, presented to us by tradition, reducing the christian revelation to a myth, a conspiracy of deceit or, at best, an unfortunate exaggeration of fact. Fr. Ricciotti approached his biography of Christ with all the critic's standard equipment, except preconceived prejudice, and applied all the critic's rigorous norms in the evaluation of historical data, but did not reach the critic's conclusion. It comes as no surprise then to learn that by 1951, only ten years after publication, his work of masterly scholarship had already run through fourteen editions and over seventy thousand copies in Italian, and had taken its place among the classic lives

of Christ. With regard to the full English version, published from America in 1947, it must be said that few foreign works have had the benefit of such able and accurate translation.

Now the Mercier Press gives us this abridged popular edition of the work, clearly produced for a new category of readers. Gone from this edition are the accurate documentation and the searching, yet lucid, scrutiny of "critical" theories which gave Fr. Ricciotti's work its distinctive value for many of us. Thus the introductory section, which constituted about one third of the original, is vastly reduced, and the actual biography, while more complete, is shorn of the many digressions on textual and historical problems which punctuated the original narrative. Nevertheless, the conclusions of Fr. Ricciotti are there in all their logical sequence and the translation is as readable as ever. Those who have appreciated the full work will be inclined to see in this Ricciotti's "Life of Christ" without Ricciotti. This edition is not for them. It certainly deserves the highest commendation to others who have not the opportunity to make a "study" of Christ but are anxious to learn more of His life and work. I know of no book where they will find the theme presented as logically and as pleasantly as in this popular edition.

B.H.

*

*

*

*

THE MYSTICAL THEOLOGY OF ST. BERNARD, by Etienne Gilson. Sheed and Ward, London, 1954. pp. x, 256. English price, 12/6.

What a pity that the title and literary form of this book will deter so many prospective readers! M. Gilson's works are always very much more than an historical investigation into certain obscure problems in the history of medieval thought. In spite of its forty-four pages of notes, this is a book that will appeal to all who like their spiritual reading to be both speculatively satisfying and practically useful. Few of the great mystics are so useful as St. Bernard to the ordinary pedestrian on the road to perfection, for few have possessed his psychological insight, and none has equalled him in imaginative power. Now M. Gilson has shown that underlying his apparently spontaneous imagery there is a precise and elaborate theology of love.

From Patristic times the relations between "selfish" and "disinterested" love have presented a constant challenge to theologians and many difficult problems of exegesis for the historian. In St. Bernard's case many have claimed that his doctrine is riddled with contradictions. For he asserts the priority, both *de jure* and *de facto*, of carnal, self centred love as a natural necessity for man before even the love of God. But he also teaches that we ought to rise above carnal love to love God for His own sake. Does Grace then destroy Nature? No, replies St. Bernard, it perfects Nature. The pure love of God has its roots in the carnal love of self. Many have tried to explain away this paradox, supplying "benign interpretations" of St. Bernard's most emphatic assertions. M. Gilson has shown that St. Bernard is not only capable of standing on his own ground, but takes his place among the great speculative theologians.

J.B.

CHURCH AND STATE THROUGH THE CENTURIES, a Collection of Historical Documents with Commentaries, translated and edited by Sidney Z. Ehler, LL.D., and John Morrall, M.A., Ph.D. London. Burns and Oates, 1954. pp. xii + 625. 57/6.

Literature in English on the general question of Church and State, and its history in particular, has not been abundant. Evidence of this lies in the work here reviewed, which for the first time brings between the covers of one book, the pertinent historical documents on this subject. For this service we are indebted to two men of distinction in the field of learning. In the preface, Michael Tierney, President, University College, Dublin, writes:

"Dr. Ehler has behind him a rich tradition of Continental jurisprudence and political science and Dr. Morrall is a product of the Oxford Schools."

Some eighty historical documents have been gathered on the relations of Church and State since the foundation of Christianity. They have been arranged in eight Chapters, from "The Roman Empire and the Dark Ages" to "The Age of Socialism and Totalitarianism." To ensure continuity and background, each chapter is prefaced by an introduction, and each document is accompanied by an explanatory commentary.

The value of this publication lies not only in its documentation of important events and eras, but more so, perhaps, in its presentation of the whole cycle of the Church's direct relations with the temporal power, from its foundation down to the present. If any defect is to be noted, it is in the omission of the important Christmas address of Pius XII in 1944 on Democracy and Peace. The inclusion of such readily available documents as *Rerum Novarum* and *Quadragesimo Anno* seems scarcely warranted.

In view of the serious problems of Church-State relations that are harassing every country in the world to-day, this work will be welcomed for presenting what light history has to contribute. This will recommend it to churchmen, statesmen and men of affairs. The fact that it treats its subject against a background of authentic basic documents will recommend it to all students of history.

P.P.F.

*

*

*

*

SUNDAY SERMON OUTLINES, by the Very Reverend Francis J. Connell, C.Ss.R., S.T.D., LL.D. Frederick Pustet Co., Inc., New York. pp. 324.

Much sympathy is felt for the Father whose Superior has told him to give his sermons to the printer — they never read as well as they sound; but, at least, he may rejoice in the merit of obedience. Father Connell, the well-known American Redemptorist, associated with the Catholic University of Washington, in printing his "Sunday Sermon Outlines," makes no apology, nor does he deserve anything but praise. His is a very solid and a very useful work.

These are not published sermons: they are just what the title says — outlines. They are more than notes, and may be read as they stand,

each outline occupying a page of the volume, and taking a little over two minutes to read. They were published originally year by year, for the use of the Priests in the Archdiocese of Washington, who were following a five-year sermon plan. Now the series has been printed under one cover.

This work, of its nature, contains no oratory, but it is surprisingly smoothly written. Staccato sentences are kept down to a minimum, although often enough, of necessity, the ideas have to be listed rather than linked.

The author knows people, and is not unaware of the needs of the day. The five-year division is nothing new: Apostles' Creed, Moral Law, Sacraments, Sunday Gospels, and the Blessed Eucharist; but the various topics under each heading are given straight-forward treatment, simple and clear, and applied to every-day problems. Sixty, or more, sermons are outlined for each year, so that a generous margin is provided for those "extra Sundays after Pentecost," and each subject, the author claims, may be amplified to fit the ten or the twenty-minute sermon. While the topics follow the general scheme quite closely, the preacher does not find himself bound to speak about Death, for instance, on the Feast of the Nativity. Indeed, much thought has been given to the dovetailing of the different subjects with the liturgical cycle. The book carries an appendix for Feast-days (three only): the Immaculate Conception, the Assumption, and All Saints' Day — Holy-days of Obligation in the U.S.

Considering the wide range of outlines offered, with any repetition relieved by varied presentation, and bearing in mind the nature of the work, the reviewer has almost to be unfair to suggest that occasionally the treatment could be fuller. The references to Communism, for instance, mainly concerns the "evils of", not the "remedies for"; the right and the significance of Private Property do not appear; and surely strikes do occur in America! If the plan—and, maybe, that is not the author's creation — falls a little short of a present-day adequate, it is in this sociological section.

The obvious usefulness of the work is for the Priest who classes himself so busy that he has not the time in the middle of the week to pull down a few books relevant to the Sunday sermon; he is not able to read a chapter here, and chase a reference there, making notes as he proceeds, which he will knock into his own personal sermon by Saturday. If a Priest finds himself unprepared, even as late as Sunday morning, and, happily, has "Sunday Sermon Outlines" on his shelves, he may thank Father Connell for coming to his rescue; for he will have some solid doctrine organized in arguable form, ready-made. Which is not to say that the usefulness of the book is confined to the busy Priest described above. It is a work any ideas-seeking preacher could refer to (with the aid of its exhaustive index), from which he could be led to further reading and fuller development of his subject.

We repeat: a very solid and a very useful work.

C.S.P.